FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-120
Wednesday
22 June 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-120 CONTENTS *22 June 1988*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov 'Amazed' at Kampelman Statement on Treaty 1
  Bogachev on Kampelman Remarks 1
UN Groups Submit Arms Control Drafts 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Reportage on Toronto Economic Summit 3
  First Day Assessed *[Shalnev in IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 3
  Pogodin Commentary 3
  Reagan 'Sidestepped' Discord 4
Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 21 Jun 4
  Discusses Mideast, Angola 4
  Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh 4
  Berlin Meeting, Afghan Rebels 5
  U.S. Restricts Soviet Tourists 5
  Condemns Canadian Expulsions 6
Zagladin Defends East-West 'Interdependence' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 22]* 6
Results of Vienna OPEC Conference Reported *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 8
Ryzhkov Greets European Quality Control Forum *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 9
Denmark Hosts International Groups on CSCE 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Korionov Takes Issue With Powell Remarks *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 10
U.S. Rejection of Summit Statement Deplored *[Ovchinnikov in PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 10
Weinberger 'Fantasy' on Soviet SDI Rejected *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 11
Alaskan Eskimos Visit Chukotka Capital *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 12
Criminal Charges Against U.S. Irangate Figure 12
NBC Poll on Dukakis, Bush Popularity Cited *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Jun]* 13

China

Further on Rogachev Talks With PRC Official 13
  Holds Press Briefing 13
  'No Obstacles' to Ties 13
  PRC Official Returns Home 14
Paper Notes PRC Plans To Certify Officials *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 14

Northeast Asia

Ryzhkov, Kamentsev Receive Mitsubishi Chairman 14
Family Seeks Political Asylum in Tokyo *[Tokyo KYODO]* 14
Takeshita's Anti-Soviet Attitude Criticized 15
DPRK Denies Western Allegations of Terrorism *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 15
Paper Cited on U.S., ROK Media Slanders *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]* 15

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Dobrynin Receives Australian Delegation ... 16
Yazov Greets PRK Counterpart on Army Day ... 16
Commentary on Upcoming Cambodian Talks in Jakarta *[(Alekseyev)]* ... 16

Near East & South Asia

Qalat Under 'Full Control' of Kabul Government *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* ... 17
Troop Pullout, Afghan Reconciliation Viewed *[Okulov in PRAVDA 17 Jun]* ... 17
Afghans, Soviets Continue To Protest Violations ... 19
    'Decisive' Actions Possible *[Oliynik in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]* ... 19
    Afghans Submit '31st' UN Note ... 19
    Afghan Spokesman Briefs Press *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* ... 20
Afghan Premier Sharq Thanks Ryzhkov for Greeting *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* ... 20
Taking of Hostages Condemned; Iranian Link Seen *[Bulantsev in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Jun]* ... 20
Further on Visit by Algeria's Belhouchet ... 22
    Arrival Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]* ... 22
    Dobrynin Meeting Reported *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* ... 22
    Visits Leningrad *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Jun]* ... 22
    Sees Yazov, Leaves for Home *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Jun]* ... 23
Soviet, Arab 'Representatives' Discuss Mideast ... 23

Sub-Saharan Africa

'Tensions' in Northern Somalia Viewed ... 23
CPSU Delegation Begins Zimbabwe Visit *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* ... 23
    Skiba Received by Mugabe *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* ... 24
U.S., RSA Sincerity in Peace Effort Questioned *[Pavlov]* ... 24

East Europe

Gerasimov Gives News Conference in Prague *[Prague VECERNI PRAHA 16 Jun]* ... 24
Honecker, Demichev Meeting Reported ... 25
Defense Minister Lushev Leaves for Hungary *[KRASNAYA ZVAZDA 22 Jun]* ... 25
Soviet Weekly To Be Published in Hungary ... 25
Polish Sejm Session Replaces Foreign Minister *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* ... 25
Romanian Official Rebuked Over Chemicals Scandal *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Jun]* ... 26
Tula CPSU Chief Leads Delegation to SFRY *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* ... 26

West Europe

Positive Outcome of Greek-Turkish Talks Noted *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* ... 26
Road Transportation Agreement Signed With Turkey *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 21 Jun]* ... 27
Belgian CP Extraordinary Congress Held 18 Jun *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* ... 27
Soviet Naval Squadron Arrives in Finland ... 27
Soviet, Norwegian Fisheries Ministers Confer ... 27

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Protests Continue Over Nagorno-Karabakh *[AFP]* ... 29
'Wisdom, Tact' Cool 'Passions' in Yerevan *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 22 Jun]* ... 29
Health, Social Security Commissions Meet in Baku *[Baku]* ... 31
New Estonian 'Popular Front' Movement Described *[Helsinki]* ... 31
New Estonian First Secretary Vyalyas Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* ... 31
Tallinn Residents Polled on New First Secretary ... 33
Estonian Party Conference Platform Described ... 33

Latvian Demonstrators Support Autonomy *[AFP]* 34
Lithuanian Anthem, Flag at Vilnius Protest *[Vilnius]* 34
Lithuanian Writers Union Elects New Leaders *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 15 Jun]* 35
Ligachev Visits Moscow Construction Collective 36
Zaykov at Moscow Urban Development Council *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 22 May]* 36
Solovyev Attends Leningrad Delegates' Meeting 36
Shcherbitiskiy Attends Ukrainian CP Session 36
Murakhovskiy Chairs Environmental Meeting 37
Secretary Biryukova Tours Ivanovo Oblast *[PRAVDA 12 Jun]* 37
Report on Kirghiz 21 May Party Plenum *[Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA 22 May]* 37
Tajik, Uzbek Party Secretaries Meet 38
Kharchev on Church's Status, Ties With Vatican *[Milan L'UNITA 16 Jun]* 38
Filaret Addresses Kiev Millenium Observance *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 15 Jun]* 39
Latvia Celebrates Church Millenium 40
RSFSR Health Minister Interviewed 40
Anti-AIDS Campaign Described 41
Customs Official on Fighting Drug Traffic 41
Militia Spokesman Warns Against Disturbances 41
TV Coverage Plans for Conference Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 42
Yuriy Afanasyev Conference Nomination Viewed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 22]* 42
'Top Priority' Program on Party Conference *[Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]* 43
Referendums Possible Under Present Constitution *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 14 Jun]* 46
Attitudes to Restructuring Discussed 46
Reader Calls for Leaders' Accountability *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 47
Official Use of 'Cryptic Language' Criticized *[MOSCOW NEWS No 23]* 48
Writer Argues for 'Freedom of Thought' *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 15 Jun]* 48
Public Denunciation of 'Criminals' Urged *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 21 Jun]* 50
Stalin's Backers 'Slander Working Class' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 22]* 53
Volkogonov Book Tells 'Truth' About Stalin *[TRUD 19 Jun]* 55
    Interviewed on Stalinism 59

Economic

Economist Outlines Strategy for Restructuring *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 61
Gosplan Staffers Assess Economic Reform Problems *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Jun]* 64
Shmelev Attacks Bureaucratic Management Methods *[Sofia TRUD 20 Jun]* 67
Merits of State Acceptance System Questioned *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 68
More Cooperatives Established Since Law Passed 69

Agricultural

Nikonov Visits Kurgan, Chelyabinsk Oblasts 69
    Addresses Oblast Aktiv *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Jun]* 69
    PRAVDA on Tour *[17 Jun]* 72
Nikonov Attends Machinery Supplies Meeting *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 8 Jun]* 73

Scientific

'Cosmos-1954' Satellite Launched 21 Jun 74
Kharitonov Reports on Soviet Space Activities 74
Scientists Say No Ozone Hole Over Antarctic 75
Leaders Sign Obituary of Geologist Smirnov *[[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 75

Military

Tank, Train Collide; Officers Disciplined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jun]* 75

Karpov 'Amazed' at Kampelman Statement on Treaty

LD2106123388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1035 GMT 21 Jun 88

["Urgent: Max Kampelman's Strange Discovery"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 21 Jun (TASS)—In addition to the U.S. President's optimistic utterances to the effect that signing a Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic offensive weapons is still possible this year, skeptical voices are being heard more and more frequently from the other side of the ocean. Attempts are being made to depict the matter in such a way that blame for the emergence of new obstacles on the road to a treaty on strategic offensive weapons will fall on the Soviet side.

"I was amazed at the statement by Max Kampleman, aide to the U.S. State Department, that the Soviet Union has allegedly changed its stance put forward at the Washington summit, and is only now insisting on solving the problem of sea-based cruise missiles as an essential condition of concluding a treaty on strategic offensive weapons," Viktor Karpov, head of the directorate on problems of arms limitation and disarmament of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said today in an interview with TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov.

Max Kampelman's assertion can indeed be called a "discovery." The fact of the matter is that the Soviet Union raised the question of the need to resolve the problem of sea-based cruise missiles at the very start of the talks on nuclear and space weapons, while the U.S. side tried to avoid this resolution. In October 1986 in Reykjavik, the United States agreed to conduct a joint search for a solution to this problem. At the summit in Washington, the sides "agreed and undertook to establish maximum quantities of such missiles and to carry out a search for mutually acceptable and effective methods of verification to implement such restrictions." That is what is said, word for word, in the joint statement on the results of the Washington summit.

"Without resolving the problem of sea-based cruise missiles, it is impossible to conclude a treaty on strategic offensive weapons because, while reducing the number of other types of delivery vehicles to 1,600 items and the overall number of nuclear strategic offensive weapons in the Soviet and U.S. arsenals to 6,000 items, we cannot permit these limits at sea to be circumvented by the deployment of hundreds, if not thousands, of nuclear tipped sea-based cruise missiles," said Viktor Karpov. "If such a thing is permitted, then the treaty on strategic offensive weapons would be fiction: incidentally, fiction that would scarcely get through confirmation in the U.S. Congress."

Bogachev on Kampelman Remarks

LD2106151488 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, 21 June—Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military matters, writes:

The head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, Max Kampelman, has actually confirmed that the United States rejects a number of formerly agreed conditions for the signing of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons.

In an interview for journalists on the 'Worldnet' television network, Kampelman insisted on Washington's right to carry out any kind of ABM tests, including those which are unambiguously prohibited by the ABM Treaty. Meanwhile, during the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington, the sides pledged themselves to observe this treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972.

The head of the U.S. delegation described as 'propagandist' a report by the Congressional Bureau of Technological Research, and also a project by a group of Pentagon experts, in which the conclusion is reached that the 'Star Wars' program will not ensure any kind of reliable defense for the United States and will only lead to the undermining of the 1972 ABM Treaty. Kampelman assured the journalists that the United States allegedly has "no intention of rejecting the ABM Treaty." However, in doing so, he insisted on the U.S. Administration's right to interpret the treaty as it sees fit, depending on the progress of work to militarize space.

Responding to questions from correspondents, the U.S. diplomat remarked that a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons can be signed only in the event that the sides, once again in violation of the obligations accepted at the summit, reject any kind of limitations on sea-based cruise missiles. Washington's main argument here consists in the fact that the bilateral admittance of Soviet and U.S. inspectors onto naval vessels to verify [proverka] the relevant agreement, is "unacceptable" to the United States.

In his interview, Kampelman finally dispelled the myth of the U.S. side's adherence to the idea of an "all-embracing and effective verification [proverka] of the observance of the agreements." Moreover, he once again demonstrated the unwillingness of the administration in Washington to conclude a just agreement with the USSR on reducing the arsenals of the more dangerous nuclear weapons systems with a range of more than 5,500 km.

Attention is drawn to the fact that while verbally proclaiming the need for the separate resolution of questions on reducing various categories of weapons, Washington's official representatives have now unexpectedly begun to link the problem of strategic nuclear systems with a preliminary unilateral reduction of Soviet conventional forces in Europe.

UN Groups Submit Arms Control Drafts

LD2106191688 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 21 TASS—TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The working groups of the U.N. General Assembly's third special session on disarmament have submitted to its delegates the drafts of the texts on basic approaches to containing the arms race.

The documents published today evaluate the recent developments in relations between the USSR and the United States as holding out hope. The recently concluded treaty on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles has opened for the first time ever the prospect for real reductions in the process of nuclear disarmament attendant with stringent verification, one of the drafts says. Thus, an important foundation was laid down for the two major nuclear powers to conclude an agreement on a 50 percent reduction in their strategic nuclear arsenals.

So far as the ultimate goal of totally abolishing nuclear armaments has not been attained, the earliest and drastic reduction in them retains crucial importance to international peace and security, one of the documents says. Therefore, halting nuclear tests by all states as a part of the process of effective nuclear disarmament with due account for the task of non-damaging their security will be in the interests of the entire mankind.

The working groups of the special session hold that all states should vigorously contribute towards preventing the arms race in space in the interests of maintaining international peace and security, promoting international cooperation and mutual understanding.

Vigorous efforts should be taken both on a bilateral and multilateral basis. The call to continue and intensify the negotiations on working out effective agreements aimed at preventing the arms race in space is addressed specially to the United States and the USSR.

Representatives of the working groups underscored the need to conclude within the shortest possible time a convention banning chemical weapons and drew attention to close relationship between disarmament and development.

One of the documents tabled notes that realization of the multilateral nature of security, the importance of its non-military aspects—political, economic, social, humanitarian and ecological—constantly grows among the world community.

Reportage on Toronto Economic Summit

First Day Assessed

PM2206090588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jun 88 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[Special correspondent A. Shalnev dispatch: "Leaders Consult"]

[Text] Toronto—At this conference, which is officially called economic, questions of economics, trade, and finance have clearly been pushed into the background. At any rate, that was the case on the first day of the 14th annual meeting of the leaders of the seven leading capitalist states.

Questions of East-West relations and arms control were the main focus of attention. As was expected, President R. Reagan gave a detailed report on his recent trip to the Soviet Union. This took place at a working dinner that lasted until late. It was the key event of the day. By the time this report was filed, spokesmen for the White House and the "Big Seven" countries' other top departments were still not ready to give journalists a detailed briefing on what R. Reagan had said and what had been the reaction to it.

But some information was released. Speaking about the main impressions that the White House incumbent had gained from his trip, Presidential press spokesman Marlin Fitzwater stressed that R. Reagan had formed the conviction that the Soviet leader was serious about implementing reforms and seriously interested in developing relations with the West.

But the West itself prefers to adopt a wait-and-see posture. Those were the approximate words of a top British civil servant who, in answering my questions, spoke of the need to "redouble vigilance" with respect to Soviet foreign policy. What is in mind?

"We should not pretend that everything is wonderful. There are problems: For instance, the imbalance in conventional arms, your enormous fleet in the Far East, and so forth."

"Do other conference participants share this view about heightened vigilance?"

"Yes, they do. That was my impression."

Whether this impression is right will most probably become known on Monday, when the heads of state and government of the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Japan, Italy, and Canada issue a political declaration—a program document in which attention will focus on the questions of East-West relations, including arms control issues.

"Incidentally," I asked M. Fitzwater, "how good are the prospects of a strategic offensive arms reduction and limitation treaty being concluded between our countries before President R. Reagan leaves the White House?"

"The President, of course, would like a treaty to be drawn up by then, but at this stage it is impossible to say when it will be ready."

I do not rule out the possibility that the wait-and-see attitude preferred by the White House is one of several factors—although not necessarily one of the main factors—delaying the elaboration of a treaty on strategic offensive arms.

Among the other political issues which the leaders of the "Big Seven" got right down to tackling on the first day of the summit were the questions of the fight against drug smuggling, terrorism, and, in particular, hijackers. I understood from behind-the-scenes conversations with people close to certain delegations that discussion of these problems did not produce any conflicts or disputes. On the contrary, the sides revealed a solid degree of unity—particularly with regard to the prevention of terrorism in the skies.

As to the fight against drugs, we have repeatedly heard good words here about the agreement reached several months ago between Britain and the Soviet Union and which, as one of the British spokesmen noted, has already had "excellent results." The experience of British-Soviet cooperation was received with interest. And this, of course, is not the only area where experience—ours or that of the "Big Seven" countries—will become much stronger if it is utilized on a bilateral or multilateral basis.

Pogodin Commentary

LD2106130488 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Radio Moscow news analyst Aleksandr Pogodin comments on the economic summit of the seven major capitalist countries of the world. He writes the following:

At the 3-day meeting in Toronto, Canada, the heads of state and governments of the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, and Japan discussed many problems. And though as always the meeting was called an economic one, priority was clearly given to political problems. Perhaps that is because some of the very acute issues, such as economic differences between the Common Market and the United States, or, say between the United States and Japan, again remained practically unsolved. What strikes one, when reading the political declaration approved in Toronto, is that about two-thirds of it is devoted to the different aspects of East-West relations.

The general approach to that very important problem seems to be changing, as compared to what was said at such summits in the past. Confrontation is giving way to realism. It seems to me that those changes are directly connected with the new positive trends that are developing in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and also with the Soviet-American summit meetings and with the results attained.

The political declaration in Toronto says that the Soviet-American treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles is the first agreement in history on actually reducing nuclear arms. It's a precedent for future agreements, and first of all the one on reducing strategic offensive arms. At the same time, however, it is simply impossible to agree with some of the assertions made by the leaders of the seven countries. And that includes the statement that a better international climate is the result of the tough stand taken by the West as regards the Soviet Union. It is also impossible to agree with the claim that a nuclear deterrent is a guarantee of peace and freedom. The assessment of the Soviet position on some of the regional conflicts are also totally unacceptable. There are also some other similar statements in the declaration. But getting rid of old stereotypes, says Aleksandr Pogodin, is a difficult and long process and requires new efforts on the part of both the West and the East. And what's most important, the process is continuing and that, to my mind, is borne out by the political declaration of the summit in Toronto.

Reagan 'Sidestepped' Discord

LD2206084188 Moscow TASS in English 0621 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 22 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan has held a news conference in Toronto following the economic summit of the seven leading capitalist countries there.

In his opening statement he limited himself to making mostly general observations and declarations about the need for such forums at the highest level, noting that "today, policy coordination is a major pillar of the economic policies of all our countries".

Reagan briefly listed the main issues discussed at the meeting of the heads of state and government of the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Canada and Japan.

According to his words, they had "a fruitful exchange of views on East-West relations, terrorism, and regional political issues".

But the President in his statement completely sidestepped sharp economic disagreements which have proved too wide to be overcome in Toronto.

This applies first of all to the issue of government subsidies for agricultural production, which has long been a serious irritant in economic relations between the United States and its West European partners.

Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 21 Jun

Discusses Mideast, Angola

LD2106144288 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—"An attempt to cast aspersion on our policy in the Middle East is made in a number of commentaries that have appeared of late in newspapers and magazines published in Arabic," Chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing here today. It is written about an alleged "Soviet-American collusion at the expense of Arabs", about "the Soviet Union's concessions in the Palestinian question" and alleged "reorientation" of the Soviet policy toward Israel. Such assessements and commentaries contradict truth, he noted.

Soviet representatives who visited Arab countries and had conversations at the top level there have been told that Arab leaders have confidence about the Soviet policy, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said. They highly appraise the results of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Moscow and they hold that the Soviet-American dialogue opens new opportunities not only for ending the arms race, but also for solving regional conflicts, including the Arab-Israeli one. And not one of the Arab leaders had or have any doubts as to what concept of the Middle East settlement the Soviet Union upholds, whose legal rights and interests it protects.

Gennadiy Gerasimov said that the second round of the talks among Angola, Cuba and the Republic of South Africa with the United States mediation, on matters of the settlement of the conflict situation in Southern Africa will start shortly in Cairo. The hope is expressed in Moscow that during the meeting in Cairo all its participants will manifest a constructive and responsible approach aimed at the achievement of reasonable agreements certainly with respect for the United Nations decisions and norms of international law.

Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD2206144088 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 22 TASS—Even though no incidents occur in Nagorno-Karabakh, the situation in the autonomous region remains complicated, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told newsmen here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, said at the briefing that a rally in support of the decision of the session of Nagorno-Karabakh's regional soviet, or council, was held in Yerevan's Theatre Square on Tuesday night.

Speakers at the rally demanded that the inquiry into the Sumgait crimes be carried out by the USSR Supreme Court.

They also demanded that Armenian Interior Ministry bodies strictly punish those guilty of clashes in areas inhabited both by Armenians and Azerbaijanis.

Gerasimov pointed out that the situation in Baku remained calm. Party and local Government bodies jointly with factory workers assumed responsibility for maintaining law and order. Military units patrolled streets.

An international symposium on language studies with the participation of research workers from the United States, the Netherlands and other countries, held in that city, he said, was an indicator of the normal situation.

He said that representatives of the Azerbaijani leadership flatly rejected the BBC hoax about sharp criticism towrds the Armenian leadership allegedly expressed by the head of protocol of the Azerbaijani Foreign Ministry.

According to the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, there emerged a problem of providing housing and jobs to Azerbaijanis moving out of Armenia. Migration was also uner way in the opposite direction, he added.

"Holiday homes and boarding houses provide accomodation for the settlers. Many settle down in the countryside. A government commission led by Musa Mamedov, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of Azerbaijan, left Baku for Yerevan to settle migration-related issues."

Berlin Meeting, Afghan Rebels

LD2106145888 Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—The Soviet Union supports the idea of creating nuclear-free zones, Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a briefing here today. Touching upon the statement by the GDR leader Erich Honecker at the current international meeting in Berlin for nuclear-free zones, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry specially noted the proposal on "establishing a hot line" between Prague, Berlin and Bonn, on setting up a confidence-building centre fitted out with the necessary equipment.

"We think it to be a highly interesting initiative. Its implementation would help towards building in that area a more favourable climate, stabilising the situation along the dividing line between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO member-countries," the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said. "We hope that this initiative will be evaluated at its due worth by the West German side."

Commenting on the results of the meeting of the leaders of the seven major capitalist nations, Gennadiy Gerasimov pointed out a number of positive aspects, in particular, the preparedness of the "seven" for continuing East-West dialogue and cooperation. Meanwhile, he said, mention was again made in Toronto of the proposition of some "superiority" of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries in conventional weapons in Europe, which is not true, and a "build-up of Soviet military power in the Far East. As far as Europe is concerned, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said, the "seven" disregarded for some reason our proposals on an exchange of data about the armed forces and arms in the region from the Atlantic to the Urals, to check on that data through on-site inspection, to eliminate disbalances and asymmetry found out in the course of that exchange and inspection, and then reduce on a mutual basis the armed forces by half a million. There is no proof, he stressed, either of a build-up of Soviet military power in the Far East.

At times the Western radio stations report not news but rumours, Gennadiy Gerasimov said, commenting on reports on the capture of the Afghan city of Qalat by armed opposition. In real fact, he said, the city is fully under the control of the local authorities appointed by the central government in Kabul. The attempts to attack Kalat were successfully repelled by the Afghan Government troops. Elaborating on the subject of the situation around Afghanistan, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry noted that the forming of a self-styled "government in exile" in Pakistan's territory is a crude violation by the Pakistani side of its commitments under the Geneva accords. "We are also amazed at the reports reaching from Washington that they are discussing the possibility of appointing their envoy in the rank of ambassador to the armed opposition," Gennadiy Gerasimov said.

The spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry reaffirmed that a six-man delegation of Israeli Consular officials is expected to arrive in the Soviet Union in the latter half of July.

U.S. Restricts Soviet Tourists

LD2206131888 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 22 TASS—Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, described the incident in the USA which involved a group of Soviet tourists as an episode which demonstrates the limits of American freedoms. He was speaking today a a briefing in the Foreign Ministry Press Centre.

Gennadiy Gerasimov told journalists that a group of Soviet tourists stayed in the USA on June 2-16 on a tour arranged by American Express. American trade unions, which maintain friendly ties with Soviet trade unions, prepared a programme along the entire itinerary of the trip for this tourist group. In particular, they provided for meetings with American workers, union activists, visits to enterprises, offices, and homes of some American citizens who had earlier been in the USSR. The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that the granting of American visas was not accompanied by oral or written restrictions on contacts with the representatives of American trade unions, therefore some members of the tourist group accepted invitations to visit the headquarters of several sectoral trade union affiliations of the American Federation of Labour and Congress of Industrial Organisations, had talks and meetings with their American counterparts in Washington and Chicago.

When the group arrived in San Francisco on June 8, a representative of the American Express company informed the group leaders that he was instructed by the headquarters of the company with reference to the State Department to warn the Soviet tourists to refrain in future from meetings and conversations with the representatives of American trade unions, including those on an unofficial basis. It was pointed out that otherwise the members of the group would have their visas cancelled and have to leave the United States.

Gennadiy Gerasimov pointed out that "protests against this were heard from the American trade unions as well. They regarded the actions by the U.S. authorities as direct infringement on their own rights and freedoms. However, the State Department did not change its decision and therefore the Soviet tourists could not help but obey this decision."

The Soviet spokesman stressed that "during meetings between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. state secretary the question of discriminations against Soviet trade unions was raised on more than one occasion. The American side promised to study the problem. As this incident shows, it is still being studied."

Condemns Canadian Expulsions

LD2206122488 Moscow TASS in English 1209 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 22 TASS—Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of a Soviet Foreign Ministry Directorate, made the following statement at today's briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists:

"In connection with the decision of Canadian authorities to declare several staff members of Soviet offices in Ottawa and Montreal personae non gratae, the following has to be said. First, it is an obvious provocation, planned in advance, which has nothing to do with the nature of the activities of Soviet people in Canada. Allegations that they engaged in something inadmissible are entirely groundless and far-fetched.

Second, this action by the Canadian authorities was clearly timed to coincide with the moment when prospects for a positive change in East-West relations took shape, including Soviet-U.S. and Soviet-Canadian relations. The opponents of such a turn of events are trying to frustrate this process, raising all kinds of obstacles. The Canadian security service served as a convenient tool in the hands of these forces.

Third, this anti-Soviet action also belies the internal political struggle in Canada, when some people are trying to pursue their selfish interests by worsening the relations with the Soviet Union. Summing up, one can say that the actions of the Canadian Government were primarily aimed against further improvement of the international situation, Soviet-Canadian relations and, finally, against the interests of the Canadian side itself.

The provocation of the Canadian authorities naturally will not remain without due reply," the Soviet spokesman said.

Zagladin Defends East-West 'Interdependence'

PM2006152588 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 22, 29 May 88 p 6

[Article by Vadim Zagladin: "No Need To Fear Similarity"]

[Text] During a public lecture I received a notice from the hall which said: "The 27th Congress of the CPSU has put forward a thesis on the interdependence of the contemporary world. I don't agree with it. If it is a question of interdependence, does it mean that socialism and capitalism are interdependent? Does it mean that we depend on the USA and the USA depends on us? For so many years we have worked to secure our own country's independence and we declare that we are for the independence of other countries. How then is it possible to speak about interdependence?"

Honestly, I understand the feelings of the person who wrote this notice. "Interdependence" is a new concept in our political vocabulary (along with many others beginning with "perestroyka"). Previously we saw it in a sceptical, if not altogether negative, light. I remember, for example, how very recently, in discussions with some Western politologists, many of our authors sharply criticized them for their use of the term "interdependence", asserting that this was simply an apology for the imperialist policy of subordinating some or other countries and peoples to external diktat.

These remarks might be justified in several cases (everything depends on the context). But the global negation, if I may call it that, which it expressed, of both the concept and the content, amounted to just one thing: divorce from reality and from the actual processes in the development of the modern world.

The interdependence of people, countries and nations is by no means a phenomenon of the recent times alone. In effect, the entire history of humankind has been oriented precisely towards this interdependence. And it is not at all surprising.

Since its birth humanity has seen itself as a unity, on the basis that all people are members of a single human race, no matter what nation, race or ethnic group they may belong to; a unity conditioned by the fact that production and the economic basis of social development are also one entity, a process always unfolding between man and nature—which is also common and single for all of us.

Of course, it is possible to speak about the unity of the human race at the beginning of its history only as of a definite objective quantity—and no more. Because in fact, and for a very long period of time at that, people existed locally, to use Marx's idiom. Individual seats of civilization were practically not connected with one another. But later on they gradually became linked in various ways.

But let us not delve too deep into history. The question is of things that are sufficiently well known. Let us just say that in our time the process of humanity's rise and development as a single entity has approached a qualitatively new frontier. The widely ramified economic, scientific, cultural and other ties between countries, regions and continents have developed into a comprehensive system encompassing the whole world. In the framework of this system the interdependence of all members of the world community has also acquired a new quality.

This interdependence has both positive and negative aspects.

Regrettably, interdependence has come to a head most strikingly today primarily as a negative factor. Indeed: the danger of a thermonuclear catastrophe has demonstrated to all of us, to the whole of humankind, how greatly our future—this common future of ours—how greatly we all depend on one another as passengers of the giant spaceship named Earth. And doesn't the aggravation of the ecological problem testify to the same? The natural environment that is common to all people has now found itself in jeopardy. And no one can say—this is none of my business, because the damage done to nature in one area of the planet will sooner or later have its effect everywhere.

And the positive aspect of interdependence? It is the international division of labour which amounts in effect to a powerful productive force at the disposal of the whole of humankind. It is scientific and technological exchange. It is cultural relations, the avalanche-like expansion of which we are witnessing today—for instance, the guest performances of the Harlem Dance Theatre in the USSR or the performances of Soviet artists abroad. It is the human contacts becoming ever broader and intense. The positive changes in (still insufficient, to my mind) tourism, both for our citizens, going abroad, and for foreign guests visiting us, TV space link-ups, radio dialogues, the growing number of twinned cities and enterprises....

Of course, by far not full use is being made today of the possibilities opened up by this positive aspect of interdependence. To us Soviet people and to the people of any other country they can give much more than what they are giving now. What's the snag? What obstacles exist and who piled them up?

There are many "culprits". The chief one of them is the atmosphere and policy of confrontation which have led to alienation, mistrust and even hostility. In the conditions of confrontation any attempt to expand and step up ties between countries, especially those belonging to different social systems, seems suspicious, and is sometimes even seen as dangerous.

Of course, the confrontation must primarily be blamed on those quarters in the West which have for long (actually, ever since the times of our Revolution) sought to "eradicate" socialism, this "evil empire". Even today, the activities of these quarters largely prevent humanity from making use of the advantages of interdependence and of the deepening of international cooperation.

But we ourselves, as I see it, have not always responded to the West's course of confrontation in an adequate manner. Quite often our reaction—even if prompted by the noble ideas of self-defence—has in fact led merely to a deepening of mutual animosity.

The "image of the enemy" was created in the West, as was the false idea of the "military threat from the East". But didn't we encourage this image through our internal policies (for instance, during the Stalin period)? Wasn't this operation facilitated by our being closed which, as is clear now in the epoch of glasnost, was patently unjustified?

Sometimes one hears it said—mostly in the West, but at times in our midst as well—that mutual suspicion, even hostility are inevitable in relations between countries with different social systems. I shall permit myself to express a profound doubt on this score.

We have seen not only interdependence of the modern world, but also its multiformity and contradictory nature. The dialectics of the former and the latter add up to the dialectics of contemporary development.

Indeed, the two systems are opposed in principle and in ideology. We know this. But why should this lead to hostility? To alienation? Let it be recalled that in the very first years after the Revolution, when our country was still weak and backward, Lenin articulated the idea of peaceful coexistence. This idea divided ideological disputes and the intrinsically opposite character of the systems, on the one hand, and relations between states and peoples, on the other. Lenin was for Soviet Russia's all-round cooperation with the West. He favoured reciprocal openness and contacts of every kind. And during Lenin's lifetime these contacts kept on developing, despite the difference in the social system and even despite obvious hostility towards us on the part of the official quarters in the West. I think that Lenin's adherence to contacts on the basis of peaceful coexistence was one of the motive forces behind the process—which unfolded at great speed in the 1920s—of restoring normal relations between the land of Soviets and most countries in the West.

Now we have returned to Lenin's ideas. We are open to cooperation, interaction and the realization of the advantages of interdependence. Of course, we still have to do a lot ourselves to translate our preparedness in principle into practice. And, needless to say, we need reciprocity in this endeavour on the part of our partners, of all our partners—in the East and West. But perhaps pride of place in this context should be given to the biggest nation of the Western world—to the United States.

In this area, perhaps, interdependence manifests itself sometimes most forcefully—however paradoxical this may be, despite the still very insignificant volume of our reciprocal connections. Indeed, our countries depend on each other unconditionally and in the most direct manner, primarily in the field of security. In effect, the security of the United States is impossible without the security of the Soviet Union, and vice versa. Our peoples prosperity and life itself depend on the other side's line of conduct and action.

Our countries are indeed very different, and not only socially and ideologically. But in many respects they are also very much alike. More and more often we encounter "parallel" problems—beginning, for example, with the problem of city growth down to the health of our citizens. There is no need to fear this similarity, to see it or even to discuss it as something criminal and suspicious, like an encroachment on our own character, national identity and social primogeniture. Convergence is out of the question. But the similarity of problems and the need to exchange experience and to cooperate in their solution are beyond all doubt. This is also a sign of interdependence.

It is possible to use interdependence to damage the other side, to "subordinate" it to your influence and to change its social system. This leads to nothing good—the past has offered sufficiently cogent proof to this effect.

But interdependence can be used for the benefit of both sides. By cooperating we can—and will—compete, but compete in conditions of equality and mutual respect, peacefully, and in the name of providing ever more favourable living conditions for our peoples. We are aspiring towards this goal and we call upon our partners to do the same—I repeat, all of our partners, but primarily the Americans. This is what I would like to accentuate now on the very eve of the US President's arrival in this country.

Results of Vienna OPEC Conference Reported

PM2106145588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences I. Yermachenkov under the rubric "Reports From Abroad": "OPEC: Prices Unchanged"]

[Text] A routine conference of OPEC oil ministers was held in Vienna 11-14 June to discuss oil prices and quotas for the second half of this year.

The conference did not support the proposal from Angola, China, Egypt, Malaysia, Mexico, and Oman to make a 5 percent cut in "black gold" exports in order to stabilize the world price level. This proposal was opposed by delegations from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates. As is well known, these four countries account for almost half of all known oil reserves in the capitalist and developing world.

Although eight other OPEC members (Algeria, Nigeria, Libya, Iran, Indonesia, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Gabon) did speak in favor of reducing oil extraction during the conference, after 4 stormy days of debate they conceded to the Arab countries of the Persian Gulf and agreed to maintain the established quota for the 12 OPEC members of 15.06 million barrels per day and the price of $18 per barrel.

As a party to the Iran-Iraq conflict, Iraq refused to go along with the decisions of the OPEC conference. As early as last year it asked that its oil extraction quota be raised to the Iranian level. At present Iraq extracts some 2.5 million barrels of oil per day, which exceeds its quota.

The other party—Iran—also demanded that its quota be raised at the beginning of the conference, although by the end of the conference the Iranian delegation had lifted its objections and agreed to support the united OPEC stand.

On the eve of the OPEC conference, the price of oil fell by $2 a barrel against the price set by this organization. Western specialists were predicting that if the oil-producing countries did not lower the total "black gold" extraction quota by 500-600,000 barrels a day, oil prices would fall even further.

However, R. Lukman, Nigerian minister of petroleum resources, believes that oil prices will not fall if OPEC strictly abides by its quotas and non-OPEC members contribute to stabilizing the oil market.

Ryzhkov Greets European Quality Control Forum

PM2106101988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Undated message from N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, "To the 32d Conference of the European Organization for Quality Control Participants"]

[Text] I cordially greet the 32d conference of the European Organization for Quality Control [EOQC] participants and guests who have gathered in the Soviet Union.

Clearly, there is no nation which does not have its traditions of skillful, high-grade labor. From time immemorial, people have valued craftsmanship and taken care that its sources do not dry up, that its techniques and secrets are passed on from generation to generation.

In our time too, quality remains the subject of professional pride of the working man. Quality today means the fullest possible satisfaction of consumer demand as well as high production and service standards, and ultimately also the guarantee of a flourishing economy and of people's prosperity.

In conditions of deepening economic, scientific, and technical integration, quality is increasingly becoming an international issue. Its successful solution depends largely on the joint efforts of different countries. Your organization's contribution to this cause is considerable and generally recognized.

We attach great importance to the 32d EOQC conference, which is taking place under the motto "Quality, Progress, Economy." The conference participants have gathered in our country at an important time of its restructuring, of radical transformations in all the spheres of our society's life. Soviet people are engaged in a vigorous, creative quest for new solutions in the struggle for quality, drawing on progressive international experience in their efforts.

I am confident that the work of the EOQC will, by creating objective conditions for the expansion of the sphere of international industrial, scientific, and production collaboration, continue to serve the further development of mutually advantageous international cooperation.

I wish the conference participants and guests success in their work.

N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Denmark Hosts International Groups on CSCE

LD2006135688 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Text] Copenhagen June 20 TASS—On June 16-19, the capital of Denmark hosted an international forum of public organisations and parties of the participating countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) focussing on disarmament and international security. It was sponsored by the Danish Radical Liberal Party (RV).

The forum gave center stage to the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow. It welcomed the treaty to scrap intermediate- and shorter-range missiles as an important step towards a total elimination of nuclear weapons. It expressed the hope for a successful completion of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on slashing by half strategic offensive armaments.

Participants in the conference showed keen interest in the changes taking place in the Soviet Union, noting that they have contributed to warming the international climate.

They adopted a statement upon the results of the meeting, which underscores the need to give fresh impetus to public organisations' efforts to carry on the process of disarmament and conclude new agreements in the arms limitation field. In view of this, a decision was made to continue the dialogue on security issues within the framework of conferences involving the public of the CSCE countries. The next forum of this kind will be convened in Bulgaria in 1990.

The joint delegation of the Soviet Peace Committee and the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation attended the forum.

United States & Canada

Korionov Takes Issue With Powell Remarks

PM2106153183 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA political observer Vitaliy Korionov "Viewpoint" article: "On the Usefulness of Pondering"]

[Text] "Will a more modern and more efficient Soviet Union be in our national interests and those of our allies? Or will this more modern and more efficient Soviet Union, if it really becomes that, simply be a greater threat—and not only a military threat but also an economic threat?"

This question was heard the other day from the rostrum of the Atlantic Council, a session of which was held at the U.S. State Department. It was posed by none other than Colin Powell, the President's national security adviser. And the person asking the question candidly went on to say: "I do not know the answers to these questions..."

The Atlantic Council session was not held specially to exchange opinions on restructuring in the Soviet Union. But, clearly, the impact on the world of the revolutionary changes in the USSR is so great that the question of Soviet restructuring and its consequences attracted special attention from the conference participants. Even the President in his speech at the session stated that the United States is closely watching the domestic changes in the Soviet Union.

Needless to say, the point is who is watching and from what angle. Congressman D. McCurdy, for instance, describing the reaction in Congress to the changes in our society's life, said in his speech to the council that, in his opinion, the reforms in the Soviet Union are in the interests of both the USSR and the United States. Then, on the other hand, J. Kirkpatrick, whose political views are well known, dusted off the bogey of the "Soviet threat to the Western democracies."

But let us return to C. Powell's speech. As is well known, he accompanied the President on his trip to Moscow. Sharing his views, Powell said: "On the one hand, I do not want to be pessimistic and reject everything that I saw in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, I do not want to get euphoric. But I constantly had a rather strange idea creating the impression, at least in me, that something very, very important is happening in the Soviet Union."

I think that C. Powell's "dualism" is understandable. For too long Americans have been told that the USSR is the "source of evil," that the "Soviets" are about to invade a "defenseless America," and so forth. Of course, the process of getting rid of such absurd ideas will take time—that should be no surprise. The myth of the "closed Soviet society" is so firmly rooted in the American consciousness that the President's adviser now states with surprise: "I was struck by the openness with which the Soviets met us—allowing U.S. inspectors onto test ranges in the Soviet Union and at nuclear test sites—and by the openness with which they approached the talks on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles."

But why, indeed, should it be otherwise? After all, the CPSU and the Soviet Government have long seriously based their activity on new political thinking free of the burden of dogmatism and the subjectivist approaches of the past. Before the whole world we have openly criticized the mistakes and failures in our policy, including our foreign policy. Incidentally, for some reason we have not heard such admissions from the U.S. side. Or is it innocent and unconnected with the creation of an atmosphere of tension in the modern world?

The sense of distrust is still strong. We in the National Security Council in Washington, Powell said, must do what the President is always telling us; namely, to "trust, but cut the deck..." Here it is appropriate to state that we also advocate strict monitoring of the fulfillment of disarmament agreements. Moreover, we have an even greater interest in this than the United States. The natural question, however, is: Should relations between powers be likened to a game of cards?

Clearly, it is hard for U.S. politicians to understand the means and nature of Soviet restructuring. Well, that is no surprise. Restructuring is a really new development, and it is at its very beginning. True, the most farsighted figures in the United States already realize that Moscow's innovative course, including in the foreign policy sphere, opens up such favorable prospects for the strengthening of universal peace that it would be simply unpardonable not to grasp this unique chance. I would like to assure them that the more conscientiously Washington ponders the processes developing in the USSR, the more the realization will grow there that these processes accord with the vital interests of all countries and peoples. Neither the United States nor its national security interests are an exception to this.

U.S. Rejection of Summit Statement Deplored

PM2106112788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "Viewpoint": "Coexistence or Tyranny?"]

[Text] At the third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, the Soviet Union for the first time made concrete an idea that is one of the foundations of a secure and nonviolent world. It proposed to completely eliminate by the year 2000 the presence of foreign troops and military bases on other countries' territories. This clear and well-defined political guideline is an eloquent indication of the peace-loving aspirations of the country that submitted this initiative.

How can one forget the claims of U.S. Defense Secretary Carlucci (before and after the Moscow meeting) that the "configuration of Soviet Armed Forces is still of a clearly offensive nature" and that the USSR supposedly remains the "main geopolitical enemy of the United States." Suffice it to glance at the map to see who threatens whom and whose "configuration of forces" threatens whom. It is the United States that has enmeshed the world in a chain of military bases and has deployed approximately 500,000 servicemen and forward-based systems around Soviet borders. Washington regards these outposts as means for strong-arm pressure, while at the same time attempting to ascribe to others the improper aims of the doctrine of neoglobalism.

Echoes of such views can also be found among the reactions to the Moscow talks between USSR and U.S. leaders. Charles Krauthammer, the author of a commentary in THE WASHINGTON POST, sees the positive aspect of this meeting as being that disarmament problems did not occupy center stage there. "The Soviets," the observer affirms, "like to reduce summit meetings and Soviet-U.S. relations as a whole to arms control, since they can thus gain freedom in other areas to do as they see fit."

It looks as through Moscow is only concerned to establish tyranny. But what does Washington have in mind? One episode of the Moscow meeting answers this question graphically. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary proposed to the U.S. President that the following statement be incorporated in the joint statement: No contentious problems must be resolved by military means, peaceful coexistence is viewed as a universal principle in international relations, and noninterference in internal affairs and freedom of sociopolitical choice are deemed inalienable and mandatory norms for everyone.

At first Reagan said he liked this proposal. But when the text of the document began to be definitively agreed upon, it turned out that this wording was not to the liking of some people in the presidential entourage and it was not put in the joint statement. At the news conference in Moscow, Reagan explained that he liked the "overall tone" of the statement but that his advisers saw "certain potentially ambiguous areas in it that do not reflect the overall idea of the proposal."

Only a few days later, THE WASHINGTON POST observers Lou Cannon and Don Oberdorfer related that the statement proposed by the Soviet leader seriously perplexed and alarmed the U.S. President's entourage. "Peaceful coexistence," they write, "is redolent of Soviet propaganda maneuvers for staffers of an administration that has stood firm for more than 7 years on anticommunist positions. Other elements in this statement would have contravened the course of increasing military budgets and of actively supporting anticommunist rebels in various countries within the framework of the 'Reagan doctrine' and also the campaign to defend human rights in the USSR and countries allied with it."

So then what is the point? Those who love to trample other people's lands under the military jackboot, dictate their will to other peoples, and go their own way do not like the idea of abandoning the use of force, the idea of peaceful coexistence, and the right of every people to sociopolitical choice. The desire to preserve and strengthen the U.S. military presence abroad is inseparable from the policy of neoglobalism, like the call to completely withdraw foreign troops from other people's territories is inseparable from the new thinking and the struggle for universal security. The new Soviet initiative strikingly highlighted this contrast.

Weinberger 'Fantasy' on Soviet SDI Rejected

PM2106150988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Unnamed own correspondent dispatch: "Former Secretary's Monologue"]

[Text] Tokyo—The Japanese newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN has featured on its front page a monologue by C. Weinberger, former U.S. defense secretary.

The article is not very long, but it accurately sets forth the writer's creed. There is no ambiguity in the phrases and it is crystal clear what Mr Weinberger wants—or rather, what he does not want. With all the conviction available to him the former secretary comes out against allowing common sense and dialogue to prevail in relations between Washington and Moscow.

"The Soviet Union is using all possible measures to impede implementation of the SDI project in conjunction with the United States. Why? Because it is striving to monopolize SDI for itself. The USSR has been working on the implementation of an SDI for 17 years now and has achieved great progress in this sphere. The Russians have stolen technology from the West and invested huge sums in this work. If the Soviet Union managed to acquire SDI before us, it would be a great tragedy... It is exceptionally dangerous that Congress wants to cut budget appropriations for the SDI program. The actions of Congress are for all intents and purposes encouraging the USSR, which is striving for precisely this."

The writer goes on to report that the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and the Soviet position on cuts in strategic arsenals are dictated by nothing other than the same desire to monopolize SDI, and he calls for the project to be brought to a successful conclusion at all costs.

Mr Weinberger, who retired quite recently, cannot fail to have detailed knowledge of our country's principled approach to the SDI problem. And if, despite this, he prefers to engage in unbridled falsification and fantasy, then God shall be his judge. What is sad in the final analysis is not the speculation about Soviet intentions in the SDI sphere, but the reluctance to take account of the political realities of the present day and the belligerent desire to return the world to confrontation, suspicion, and distrust. After all, the former secretary is not speaking just for himself: He reflects the sentiments of a certain group of U.S. politicians for whom the improvements in Soviet-U.S. relations are solely negative.

For these circles SDI is a kind of stumbling block that they are striving to preserve in every possible way. Why SDI precisely? Weinberger himself answers this question, although in a rather original way. Describing the tragic situation that would prevail in the event of a "Russian monopoly" on SDI, he notes: "If the Soviet Union acquires SDI, this will mean that it will be able to carry out a first strike, and if our response is considerably weakened or neutralized we will lose our power to deter the USSR."

In this passage the former U.S. defense secretary makes an admission that the Pentagon has disowned from the very outset of the "star wars" project—about the attack potential of SDI and the offensive nature of space weapons, which are becoming a new first-strike system. Whether the writer likes it or not, it follows from his arguments that the so-called defense initiative is first and foremost an element of an offensive strategy, a way to wreck strategic parity, and a step up to a qualitatively different level of the arms race. In other words, SDI means nuclear superiority—which is a serious dream for those of Weinberger's persuasion. Burying any hope of a new detente is the only way to their cherished goal. And we are reminded of this yet again by the monologue published in SANKEI SHIMBUN.

Alaskan Eskimos Visit Chukotka Capital

PM2106150188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 88 Second Edition

[V. Timakov report: "Chukotka Plays Host to Alaska"]

[Text] Provideniye Settlement, 14 Jun—The early summer weather can be capricious on the eastern seaboard of Chukotka. Yesterday patches of cold fog, hugging the still snow-covered hills, covered Provideniye Bay. But this did not stop the Alaska Airlines crew from landing their Boeing 737 at Provideniye Airport on schedule. The plane had brought 87 U.S. citizens to the rayon center of Provideniye from the Alaskan city of Nome. This is probably the first delegation in the entire postwar history of Soviet-U.S. relations to take the shortest route to our country's territory: The flight took less than 30 minutes.

Representatives of a number of Eskimo communities, entrepreneurs, scientists, and journalists arrived together with Governor S. Cowper of Alaska, U.S. Senator F. Murkowski, and State Department staffer S. Clark. People had prepared with interest on both sides of the Bering Strait for this short, 1-day, goodwill visit.

Representatives of U.S. firms discussed with the leaders of the Chukotka area, oblast departments, and rayon enterprises the possibility of developing economic and cultural relations, tourism, and contacts between Soviet and U.S. Eskimos.

Among the first to meet the Americans on Chukotka soil was U. Ukhsima, Provideniye's oldest inhabitant, a guardian of the ancient Eskimo culture, and a holder of the Order of Lenin. Addressing the guests, she said: "These meetings make us confident of the future and of relations between our countries becoming even warmer and more human."

Senator F. Murkowski passed on to the inhabitants of Provideniye a message from U.S. President R. Reagan, noting that our peoples are linked by a common border and historic ties. The American public visit to Chukotka is a manifestation of the increasingly strong contacts between the USSR and the United States.

How simple it turns out to be for neighbors to visit each other, provided there is a mutual desire to do so.

Criminal Charges Against U.S. Irangate Figure

LD2106122588 Moscow TASS in English 0640 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 21 TASS—Former CIA master spy in Central America became an eighth man to face criminal charges over the secret arms deal with Iran, whose proceeds were diverted to provide illegal aid for the contras. Charges on five accounts of conspiracy and perjury were brought against Joseph Fernandez, who for two years headed the CIA espionage network in Costa Rica.

Fernandez is accused of conspiring with Oliver North and retired General Richard Secord to set up a secret network of supplies for the contras at a time when the CIA was banned from rendering them assistance. He is also charged with obstructing the investigation conducted by a special presidential commission on Irangate, when he gave false testimony. Besides, Fernandez claimed during secret hearings that his cooperation with Oliver North was known at the headquarters of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, the fact which his former chief denies.

Fernandez, who quit the intelligence service, is believed to be the first CIA agent to face criminal charges for conducting a secret operation.

NBC Poll on Dukakis, Bush Popularity Cited
PM2106153388 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Jun 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Dukakis Leads Bush"]

[Text] San Francisco, 17 Jun—At the present stage of the U.S. presidential campaign most American voters prefer Governor Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts, who has won the Democratic nomination. According to the results of a nationwide poll conducted by NBC television in conjunction with THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, 49 percent of those polled supported him. U.S. Vice President George Bush, his Republican rival, was supported by 34 percent of those polled.

As NBC television notes, Dukakis even received a higher rating than Bush on the issue of running the economy. In the opinion of 41 percent of Americans the governor of Massachusetts—were he to become President—would do a better job of resolving the country's economic problems, in particular the problem of reducing the huge U.S. budget deficit.

At the same time, most voters stated that Bush would do a better job than Dukakis in resolving the country's defense issues and in dealing with the Soviet Union.

China

Further on Rogachev Talks With PRC Official

Holds Press Briefing
LD2106144788 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, 21 Jun (TASS)—"As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we see no obstacles to the complete normalization of Soviet-PRC relations in all fields: political and interparty. It obviously does not depend on the Soviet side," said Igor Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, today. He was speaking here at a briefing in the Foreign Ministry Press Center on the subject of the 12th round of Soviet-PRC political consultations which have ended in Moscow, in which Tian Zengpei, PRC deputy foreign minister and special representative of the PRC Government, took part.

"In the time that has passed since the preceding round of Soviet-PRC consultations, the contacts and links between the two countries have developed," Igor Rogachev said. During the last round, much attention was paid to the Cambodian problem. The two sides set out in detail their positions on this question. An exchange of opinions took place on a number of international problems, including the situation in the Asia-Pacific region. An agreement was reached with the PRC comrades, the Soviet representative went on, to hold a third meeting in Moscow this October of representative delegations of the Soviet Union and the PRC for talks on border questions. The next, 13th, round of Soviet-PRC political consultations will be staged in Beijing in April-May next year.

Talking about the potential for development of Soviet-PRC relations, Igor Rogachev pointed mainly to spheres such as economic and scientific-technological cooperation, contacts in the field of environmental conservation, and exchanges of delegations. The number of delegations making exchanges between our countries already amounts to several hundred a year, he said. "However, we consider that this is just the start," Igor Rogachev said. "There remain reserves in the sphere of developing political contacts and enhancing the level of political dialogue."

The Soviet spokesman also noted that "patches of blue sky have appeared" in the resolution of the Cambodian problem. He called the meeting between the foreign ministers of Vietnam and Thailand held recently in Bangkok "very useful." Igor Rogachev reported the possibility of convening an informal two-stage meeting of the "four Cambodian sides" and of a number of countries of the region in Jakarta on 25 July. He expressed the opinion that "the Cambodian Government is displaying a constructive approach." "All of this inspires definite optimism," the USSR deputy foreign minister emphasized.

'No Obstacles' to Ties
OW2206082088 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] On 21 June, speaking at a briefing held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Center with regard to the 12th round of Soviet-PRC political consultations, in which Tian Zengpei, special envoy of the Chinese Government and vice minister of foreign affairs, took part, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev said: During the last round much attention was paid to the Cambodian issue. The two sides elaborated on their positions on this question and exchanged views on a number of international issues, including the situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Soviet representative said: An agreement was reached with the Chinese comrades to hold a third meeting of Soviet and Chinese Government delegations in Moscow this October for talks on border issues.

Talking about the trend in the development of Soviet-Chinese relations, Rogachev referred mainly to such areas as economic and scientific-technological cooperation, contacts in the field of environmental conservation, and exchanges of delegations. He said that the number of delegations exchanged between our two countries already amounts to several hundred a year. However, we think that this is just a start. There remains great potential in the sphere of developing political contacts and enhancing the level of political dialogue.

Rogachev asserted: As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we see no obstacles to complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations in all fields, including political and interparty relations.

PRC Official Returns Home

LD2106150488 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1439 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Beijing, 21 June, (TASS)—Tian Zengpei, special representative of the Chinese Government and PRC deputy minister of foreign affairs, who took part in the 12th round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations, returned to Beijing from Moscow today.

Answering questions from a TASS correspondent at the airport, he said that the talks took place in a frank and businesslike atmosphere, and the sides reached great mutual understanding. They exchanged opinions and understood each other better, but "no development was achieved" on concrete questions. He expressed the hope that it will be possible to achieve progress at the next round of consultations, thanks to the efforts of both sides.

Paper Notes PRC Plans To Certify Officials

PM2106152988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Cadres Certification"]

[Text] Beijing, 18 Jun—A system of certification of leading local party and administrative cadres will be introduced this year throughout the PRC in connection with the restructuring of the country's political structure and the implementation of cadres reform. This was announced here by a spokesman of the CPC Central Committee Organizational Work Department.

Leaders of party committees, people's governments, and other party and administrative organs at the level of counties, cities, and districts with county status will undergo annual certification. By the end of this year, for example, more that 110,000 local leaders and senior officials will have undergone certification. According to the spokesman of the CPC Central Committee Organizational Work Department, they will be subjected to comprehensive and strict checks. In order to pass successfully, the cadres will first and foremost have to boost their activeness to the utmost in solving the practical tasks of the restructuring now under way in the country.

Northeast Asia

Ryzhkov, Kamentsev Receive Mitsubishi Chairman

LD1706211688 Moscow TASS in English 1911 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—In the twenty years of its existence the Moscow bureau of Mitsubishi Corporation helped increase the corporation's trade turnover with the Soviet Union from 40 to 650 million dollars, said Mitsubishi's Chairman of the Board of Directors Yohei Mimura. He added in a TASS interview that last year the bulk of Mitsubishi exports to the Soviet Union consisted of steel products, machines and equipment to the sum of 360 million dollars. From the Soviet Union the Japanese firm imports mostly oil and timber products.

Yohei Mimura expressed satisfaction with the recent increase in trade ties between the two countries and reiterated Mitsubishi's readiness to take part in building a big oil and gas complex envisaged by a recently signed agreement between Soviet and American consortiums.

Speaking of other cooperation projects with the Soviet Union Yohei Mimura mentioned such fields as forestry, agriculture and fisheries. He also dwelt on the possibility of setting up joint ventures. He stressed, however, that experience should first be gained by setting up a small enterprise, for instance, for processing sea products.

Yohei Mimura, who was accompanied by many senior officials of Mitsubishi corporation, was received by the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov and his Deputy Vladimir Kamentsev. The Japanese representatives also had meetings with senior officials of Soviet ministries and foreign trade associations.

Within the framework of the delegation's visit a seminar was held today at which Mitsubishi specialists spoke about the principles and methods of their approach to setting up joint ventures overseas.

Family Seeks Political Asylum in Tokyo

OW2106032188 Tokyo KYODO in English 0243 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Tokyo, June 21 KYODO—A visiting Soviet photographer and his family are under protective custody in Japan after requesting asylum earlier this month, Japanese officials said Tuesday. According to police, the couple and their son entered the country on tourist visas in early June. The trio then went to the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo and requested asylum, saying "there is no freedom in the Soviet Union," the officials said. However, the embassy rejected their request since they were ordinary citizens and had no special political background.

The Tokyo Metropolitan Police Department and the Foreign Ministry were notified by the embassy and the three were taken into protective custody by Japanese authorities.

The photographer and his wife, both in their 30's, want to live in a "Western country." They will be allowed to stay in Japan for the time being, the officials said.

Takeshita's Anti-Soviet Attitude Criticized
LD2106191888 Moscow TASS in English 1746 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Tokyo June 21 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev reports:

Japanese journalists who cover the conference of the leaders of the seven major capitalist countries in Toronto noted that Japanese Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita was at the edge of the line of the leaders of the "Seven" who posed to dozens of photographers. The photograph run by today's evening newspapers has in a sense become symbolic as the head of the cabinet of the Japanese conservatives assumed at the conference the political stand of the extreme rightwing. This stand was manifested most clearly in his approach to relations with the Soviet Union. And as distinct from the place which Takeshita had on the photograph, this stand cannot be described as something accidental.

Most participants in the conference have in principle a positive assessment of the foreign policy course of the present Soviet leadership, the newspaper ASAHI writes. The positive assessment of the restructuring implemented in the USSR is also contained in the political declaration adopted by the leaders of the Seven, the newspaper MAINICHI writes in turn. And though Takeshita joined that declaration he expressed at the conference his own sharp view with regard to the Soviet Union, MAINICHI testifies. The gist of his viewpoint is that the influence of perestroyka, is, allegedly, not seen in Asia on behalf of which the Japanese prime minister claims to speak in Toronto. The KYODO NEWS AGENCY, amazed at Takeshita's statement ran his words as a "flash." Indeed, there is a reason to be amazed. The head of the Japanese Cabinet seems not to notice the Soviet Union's consent, registered in the INF Treaty, to eliminate medium-range missiles from the Asian part of the USSR. (Incidentally, American experts have already arrived the other day at the U.S. military base Yokota in Japan to observe the process of the elimination of Soviet SS-20 missiles). Takeshita seems not to notice the fact that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan has been started, that there is nascent progress in the settlement of another regional conflict, the Kampuchean conflict. Ignoring obvious facts Takeshita, as Asahi noted, emphasized at an official dinner on Monday the "irreversibility of the fact of the Soviet military menace" in the Far East, "the Soviet Union's vigorous striving to penetrate the Asia-Pacific region." Takeshita made calls to the West not to weaken vigilance with regard to the USSR.

The pronouncements of the Japanese prime minister who made calls in Toronto for the "cohesion of the West" have become a sort of culmination of the attempts of Japan's ruling circles to impart an "international character" to Tokyo's campaign of territorial claims to the USSR. YOMIURI testified that during the recent tour of West European countries, Takeshita urged West European leaders to support these demands. Noting this problem in Toronto, the Japanese premier made an attempt to present it as a task for the West, ASAHI writes. But there is concern in some Japanese circles, the newspaper notes, that such a stand on the matter would do nothing to promote the implementation of the visit to Japan by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. Many realistically-minded people are critical about the Japanese Government's stand. Chairperson of the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Japan Takako Doi called on Monday for a broad dialogue with the USSR. She emphasized that there will be no progress in Soviet-Japanese relations if Tokyo continues placing an emphasis only on the "territorial problem."

DPRK Denies Western Allegations of Terrorism
PM1706080388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Rebuffing the Slanderers"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 13 Jun—The newspaper NODONG SINMUN today resolutely rebuffs the Western mass media's slanderous fabrications to the effect that the DPRK is allegedly intending to carry out an "act of terrorism" against participants in the upcoming Olympics in Seoul.

The unfounded ballyhoo is of a provocative nature. It plays into the hands of those who want to perpetuate the division of the Korean nation and use the upcoming Olympic Games to promote the unseemly objective of increasing military preparations. The goodwill of the DPRK, the paper notes, has been confirmed more than once by proposals on convening a joint North-South conference and also on the joint organization of the international sports forum.

Paper Cited on U.S., ROK Media Slanders
PM2106154188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jun 88 First Edition p 3

[V. Vladimirov article under the rubric "Disinformers Persist": "Pentagon 'Olympians'"]

[Text] The U.S. and South Korean mass media are continuing to fuel an atmosphere of hysteria. In various forms they present reports alleging that the DPRK is preparing a "terrorist act" against participants in the upcoming Seoul Olympics.

It is quite understandable that these slanderous fabrications receive a very resolute rebuff from Pyongyang. Such ill-intentioned fabrications, the newspaper NODONG SINMUN, organ of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee, points out, are disseminated by vehement opponents of the cause of Korea's reunification. They are trying to foster in the public a hostile attitude toward the DPRK and undermine the republic's international prestige. This is being done, NODONG

SINMUN points out, at a time when the DPRK's goodwill has repeatedly been confirmed by proposals to convene a conference of the North and South of the country and also to jointly hold the international sports forum—the Olympics.

At the same time, such a groundless ballyhoo pursues other goals, too. And the chief of these is to use the upcoming Olympic Games to build up militarist preparations in the region. The Pentagon's "Olympic contribution" will be particularly great. According to the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI, two aircraft carrier groups of the U.S. 7th Fleet will patrol the sea regions adjacent to the Korean peninsula before the Olympics themselves and during them. And in South Korea itself the 40,000-strong contingent of U.S. servicemen will be put in a state of full combat readiness. Additional units and subunits of the U.S. Armed Forces are expected to be transferred to South Korea. And it was reported earlier that during the Olympics the Pentagon will conduct military exercises in the Sea of Japan, in which U.S. Marines stationed on Okinawa will participate together with warships and aircraft.

There is no doubt that such actions certainly do not conform to the humane ideas of the Olympic Games. And this is why disinformers are working indefatigably to whitewash at least somehow the Pentagon's irresponsible actions.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Dobrynin Receives Australian Delegation

LD2106193088 Moscow TASS in English 1949 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—Members of a delegation of the Australian Democrats Party staying in the USSR at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke about their interest in the continuation of contacts with the CPSU, interaction with it in consolidating peace and security, and the development of Soviet-Australian relations. The delegation headed by deputy leader of the party, Senator Michael Macklin was received today by Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin.

During the conversation which passed in a friendly atmosphere there was an exchange of opinions on topical international problems, including the results of the Soviet-American summit in Moscow, the course of the implementation of the Geneva acords on Afghanistan and prospects for the settlement of other regional conflicts, the situation in the Asia-Pacific region and ensurance of peace and security there. At the request of the Australian guests, Anatoliy Dobrynin told them about the course of restructuring in the USSR and preparation for the 19th all-union party conference.

Members of the delegation of the Australian Democrats Party expressed gratitude for the opportunity to visit the USSR.

Yazov Greets PRK Counterpart on Army Day

BK2206053588 Phnom Penh Domestic Service in Cambodian 0430 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] On the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Armed Forces [KPRAF] Traditional Day and Army-People Solidarity Day, Comrade Koy Buntha, PRK defense minister, has received a greetings message from USSR Defense Minister General Yazov. The message notes:

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and in my own name, I would like to extend sincere greetings and best wishes to you, comrade minister, and all Cambodian soldiers on the occasion of the KPRAF founding anniversary.

The Soviet soldiers will continue to strengthen, through all means, the ties of friendship and all-around cooperation with the Cambodian revolutionary soldiers and further support the Cambodian soldiers' determination to defend the revolutionary gains of the people who are building a new life.

May all members of the KPRAF achieve greater victories in implementing the resolution on strengthening national defense put forth by the fifth party congress.

Commentary on Upcoming Cambodian Talks in Jakarta

BK2206034988 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Commentary by station observer (Alekseyev)]

[Text] Vietnam, along with other parties, is going to attend the second stage of the unofficial meeting between representatives of the PRK and those of the opposing Cambodian parties. The spokesman of the SRV Foreign Ministry stated this at a briefing for foreign journalists in Hanoi. In accordance with the agreement reached between Vietnam and Indonesia, the meeting will probably take place in Jakarta in July. The Vietnamese Foreign Ministry spokesman further stated that we support the decision of the PRK, which adopted the proposal by Samdech Sihanouk on a meeting of four Cambodian parties sponsored by the Nonaligned Movement. Here is our observer (Alekseyev)'s comment concerning this matter:

The initiative taken by Vietnam and Indonesia since the middle of last year is thus about to bear fruit. I would like to recall that the proposal for such an unofficial meeting was made first at talks held between the Vietnamese and Indonesian foreign ministers in Ho Chi Minh City on 29 July 1987. However, at that time this constructive initiative did not receive appropriate support from the opposing Cambodian sides and their foreign mentors. In any case, the initiative did fulfill its role. In the JAKARTA TIME's view, it is this proposal which has laid the foundation for later talks between Samdech Sihanouk and Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers. These talks, which started in December last year, have become an important form of direct contact between the PRK Government and the opposition parties. The meetings between Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Sihanouk provided an opportunity to discuss in detail every aspect of the Cambodian issue and to search for some common grounds for a solution to the problem.

This is a new phase which promotes national reconciliation based on many parties. The participation in the future meeting of the four Cambodian parties, Vietnam, and other countries, will certainly give this meeting ample weight and extend the chance of a solution to the issue. This is because the Cambodian conflict is in some respect an international one which cannot be resolved without the participation of other states.

Our observer continues: In my view, there is a special and favorable atmosphere which is developing for this purpose. Only a few days ago, Cambodia and Vietnam stated that by the end of June 40,000 Vietnamese volunteer combatants will be withdrawn from Cambodia and during the remaining 6 months of this year, another 10,000 will be withdrawn. This means that by the end of 1988, the number of Vietnamese volunteer troops stationed in Cambodia will be reduced by one-half. I would like to recall that the SRV and PRK Governments have again and again expressed their intention of withdrawing all Vietnamese volunteer forces by 1990, and if an agreement is reached on a solution, this withdrawal would take place before the announced date.

Let us hope that the unofficial meeting in Jakarta would become an important step toward this kind of solution. The statement by Vietnam on its readiness to participate in the meeting in Jakarta once again clearly shows Vietnam's goodwill.

Near East & South Asia

Qalat Under 'Full Control' of Kabul Government

PM2206094788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "The 'Victory' That Never Was"]

[Text] Western radio stations sometimes broadcast rumors instead of news, G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the Foreign Ministry Information Administration, has stated at a USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center briefing. After dwelling in this connection on reports regarding the capture of the Afghan city of Qalat by the armed opposition, he announced that in fact the city is under the full control of the local authorities appointed by the central government in Kabul. The attempts to attack Qalat have been successfully repulsed by Afghan Government troops. Continuing the theme of the situation around Afghanistan, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that the creation of the self-styled "government in exile" on Pakistani territory is a gross violation by the Pakistani side of its obligations under the Geneva agreements. The reports from Washington that it is discussing the possibility of appointing a representative with the rank of ambassador to the armed opposition are also surprising.

Troop Pullout, Afghan Reconciliation Viewed

PM2106133588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA own correspondent V. Okulov dispatch: "Afghanistan: One Month On"]

[Text] Kabul—The city was shrouded in an intense heat haze. The sky, a serene deep blue in the morning, by evening is increasingly often dulled by dust clouds raised by the whirling wind—in our Central Asian border area this wind is called the "Afghan." Scarcely a drop of rain will fall on this land now before mid-fall. The gritty sensation of sand on teeth and the white dust on the armor of Soviet armored personnel carriers heading for the border, for Termez, for the motherland, are no routine detail, no sign of a long journey, but a familiar reality. The convoy of the Soviet garrison from the city of Gardeyz, led by Colonel Valeriy Gennadyevich Yevnevich on its 700 km march, reached the home bank of the Amu Darya on 14 June. Now there are no Soviet soldiers right along the entire strip of the Afghan-Pakistani border in the east of Afghanistan.

The withdrawal is proceeding according to schedule and no one should be in any doubt on this score.

What is the military situation in the regions from which the troops have been withdrawn?

"Fundamentally unchanged," Lieutenant General B. Gromov, commander of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, says. "Although the situation is still contradictory. Life is normal in the border town of Asadabad, the center of Konarha Province. This was traditionally a hotspot. Now there are fewer bombardments, although armed opposition detachments continue to threaten to cut off the road to the center of the country in order to isolate Asadabad from Jalalabad."

"It is well known that 1 month ago, on the eve of the troop withdrawal, the command of the Soviet units carried out considerable work among the inhabitants and elders of the villages adjoining the routes of the withdrawal. They also established contacts with the commanders of armed opposition detachments—large and small—belonging to the various Islamic parties with headquarters in Peshawar. Did this bear fruit?" I asked the commander.

"Undoubtedly," the general replied. "The overwhelming majority reacted correctly to our proposal despite the sinister orders from Peshawar. They realized that we had no intention of being the first to open fire and that we would immediately curb attempts to attack."

...I remember the Aybak Gorge in different times, the inconceivably vast red crags hugging the highway, the rusty shells of Afghan trucks, gasoline tankers, and other vehicles at the roadside: a traditional convenient spot for extremists to attack convoys. I know from personal experience that not a single shot rang out there this time....

"So things went as the opposition promised?"

"Virtually. There were only attempts to fire on our posts and blockhouses covering the roads east of Ghazni and south of Baraki. There are wounded at the posts. But the withdrawing convoys have suffered no losses."

Something else is causing concern, the commander continued. There are still no facts to enable us to suppose that Pakistan is reacting correctly to the incriminating evidence against it regarding the continuation of interference in Afghan affairs. We military men have convincing facts on this score at our disposal. The number of caravans from Pakistan carrying weapons for extremists has risen sharply. The weapons are generally being carried not by pack animals as before but by trucks—moreover, Pakistani military trucks.

I listened to what the commander was saying and talked with Afghan people and could not help wondering: Is the Geneva mechanism for monitoring the fulfillment of the agreements working sufficiently effectively? Is its task solely to record the precise fulfillment of the accord on the withdrawal of Soviet troops? I would add the following to Lieutenant General B. Gromov's report: Pakistan's failure to observe the agreements is bound to affect the situation in Afghanistan. For instance, the situation in Qandahar has worsened—Soviet sentry posts are being fired on more frequently. There was a rocket projectile strike on Golbahar, a population center near the Kabul-Salang Highway. According to data from competent Afghan organs, the number of bombardments has doubled in the country as a whole in the last month.

The counterrevolutionary underground has also stepped up its activity. It is operating through false propaganda and intimidation of the population. On the morning of 31 May, the security forces discovered a TNT charge in a bus in a parking lot in the capital: Another hour or two and there would have been an explosion on the highway which the people of Kabul use to go to work. These and many other facts cannot be described as anything but a result of the continuing support for extremists from the "Pakistani springboard" and attempts by the intransigent wing of the Peshawar opposition to realize its intention of fighting "until enthronement in Kabul."

But are its calculations realistic? Afghans from the armed groups, which are continuing to switch to the Government side, describe them as laughable. Many of the people, tired of war, brigandage, and violence who are tasked with fulfilling orders from Peshawar on Afghan soil, are in a mood very different from what their foreign bosses would like. In laying down their arms, they bear in mind a well-known argument in favor of their choice: G. Hikmatyar, leader of the "Islamic Party of Afghanistan," receives 80 percent of the Western aid to the "Peshawar Seven." The present situation whereby they live abroad, own villas, automobiles, and plantations, and invest money in business and foreign banks while the "second" Afghan echelon of armed detachments is wallowing in blood and dirt quite suits him and some of his fellow ringleaders of "intransigent" parties.

Reports are flooding into Kabul from various provinces in Afghanistan indicating that the processes of polarization in the armed opposition camp have not abated after Geneva but have, rather, intensified. There is a clash between the groups of people who have agreed to compromise with the authorities for the sake of a peaceful life and those who want to force them to continue the fratricidal struggle. The contradictions between opposition parties have intensified: While in Pakistan on the whole they do not go beyond the bounds of a political struggle to satisfy ambitions, on Afghan soil they inevitably develop into bloody clashes. Twenty deaths were recorded recently in Bamian Province: Booty was being shared out between opposition detachments. More than 50 deaths is the toll of skirmishes between various opposition detachments in recent weeks.

Today, 1 month after the start of the fulfillment of the Geneva accords, the refugee situation has not fundamentally changed either. While people in Afghanistan are stepping up efforts to greet a massive influx of refugees, relying on help from the international community in this, Pakistan is not removing the barriers to their return. There are innumerable pieces of evidence for this. I will cite just one: Recently a Pakistani detachment detained a group of emigres returning to their native land near a refugee camp. Weapons were fired, 1 Afghan died, 22 were arrested, and the rest were taken back to the camp.

There is no peace in Afghanistan at present, although the process of national reconciliation is unstoppable. Our country is also making its own contribution to this by withdrawing its troops and by reinforcing its economic ties with its southern neighbor. A delegation from the Kabul Council of People's Representatives Executive Committee headed by Muhammad Hakim is now in Moscow visiting partners in direct ties. On the eve of his departure we talked with M. Hakim about Kabul and about the problems of its economy. The mayor has great plans, but not enough resources to resolve elementary problems: The city is in a bad way with regard to water supplies, there is no sewerage system, and housing construction capacities are weak. I am pinning my hopes, the mayor said to me, on two factors: on enlisting private entrepreneurs in the construction and provision of amenities and on help from Soviet brothers.

...Any day now, General Gromov will travel to Moscow; he has been elected a delegate to the all-union party conference. In addition to Boris Vsevolodovich, Sergeant Sergey Shcheglov will also represent Soviet internationalist soldiers.

"What are your thoughts as you come to the conference?" I asked Lieutenant General B. Gromov.

"I am convinced that the resolution of the Afghan problem is working not only to improve international relations but also for restructuring within the country. For me, as an 'Afghan,' restructuring at the stage of the troop withdrawal consists in protecting people—we have a sense of tremendous responsibility to the mothers and fathers and everyone in the motherland who is awaiting the fighters...."

You are now hearing about the motherland and about the affairs of the party and the people from our people on Afghan territory under the burning sky in mid-June, 1 month after Soviet units headed for home.

Afghans, Soviets Continue To Protest Violations

'Decisive' Actions Possible

PM2106125788 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jun 88 First Edition p 3

[Article by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik: "Convoys From Pakistan"]

[Text] The Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan has handed to the group of UN observers the 24th note containing data on Pakistan's gross violation of the Geneva agreements.

At the Afghan Army's General Staff, I familiarized myself with an operational map denoting the rebels' base areas and training centers in Pakistan's border regions. There are more than 100 of them. There are forward base dumps at Wana, Newah, Landi Kotal, Yarukaraz [name as published], and many other places. Mercenaries of the so-called "Islamic regiments" are armed and receive terrorist training there. As previously, Chitral, West Warsak, Chaman, Parachinar, and other Pakistani regions are the chief places where they are stationed.

One of the main aims of the armed counterrevolution now is to transfer forces from Pakistani to Afghan territory and stockpile the latest weapons and ammunition to continue "the holy war until victory." And this is being facilitated by the changed situation on the border. The point is that subunits of the limited contingent are no longer conducting combat operations on the routes used to deliver weapons to the rebels. By decision of President Najibullah, Afghan border troops and army units are being withdrawn deep inside the country away from the borders with Pakistan in order to create favorable conditions for refugees to return to the motherland.

The leaders of the "Peshawar Seven" have not failed to take advantage of this circumstance. Clearly with the knowledge and approval of the Islamabad authorities, convoys of weapons are now leaving Pakistan literally day and night. Here is a list of just some of the rebel convoys recorded at the beginning of June.

On 2 June operational subunits of the Ministry of State Security and the people's militia detected and routed a weapon convoy in a region of Nangarhar Province's Shinwar District. As a result of the fighting, 12 rebels were killed, and 22 surface-to-surface missiles and 65 antitank mines were captured.

On 6 June a weapons convoy was detected 22 km northeast of Kabul. As a result of the fighting, 9 rebels were killed and 15 rockets were captured, as well as a large quantity of small arms ammunition.

On 7 June a reconnaissance group detected a rebel motorcycle convoy 120 km northwest of Lashkar Gah. As a result of the fighting, 5 motorcycles, 36 surface-to-surface missiles, and 15 mines of various types were destroyed.

"A lot of similar reports are reaching the General Staff. They graphically attest to Pakistani interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs," Lieutenant General 'Abdul Ghafur, first deputy chief of the Afghan Army's General Staff, said. "And yet it is known that under the Geneva agreements, the armed counterrevolution's material base on Pakistani territory should have been destroyed even before 15 May. Instead, official Pakistani Government organizations are ensuring the unimpeded transfer of rebel detachments, as well as weapon and ammunition convoys, over the Khyber, Kurram, and Bowlan mountain passes. Extensive use is being made of Pakistani Army transport in this."

Serious concern at the Pakistani Administration's violations of the Geneva agreements was expressed during last Monday's meeting in the Kremlin between M.S. Gorbachev and President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan. The Soviet Union and Afghanistan reckon that the UN control mechanism will finally take effective measures to stop this practice, which, if it continues, will make it necessary to take very decisive counteractions.

Afghans Submit '31st' UN Note

LD2106211788 Moscow TASS in English 2205 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 21 TASS—A regular, 31st, note was handed over today to the office of U.N. monitors in Kabul.

The note expresses a protest by the Afghan Government over the repeated violation by the Pakistani side of the Geneva agreements and requests to conduct a thorough investigation into the facts of the violations and to report about the results to the Government of Afghanistan and to personal representative of U.N. secretary-general.

Afghan Spokesman Briefs Press

PM2206115588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Observe Agreements": "News Conference at Afghan Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] Kabul, 21 Jun—A news conference devoted to the implementation of the Geneva agreements has been held at the Afghan Foreign Ministry.

It was noted at the news conference that even before the entry into force of the Geneva agreements, the Afghan side has taken a number of steps to implement them. In particular the withdrawal of military units from the country's border regions enabled peace zones free of weapons to be created there. The opposing side, however, with support from Pakistan, took the opposite course of action by swamping the border regions with weapons. Soviet troops have begun to withdraw from the country in full accordance with the agreements reached in Geneva. At present, one-fourth of Soviet servicemen have already returned home. Under an order from President Najibullah, commander in chief of the Republic's Armed Forces, the Afghan Army is not conducting active combat operations in a number of regions on the Pakistani border despite constant attacks by extremist groups. Despite the difficulties caused by many years of war, the Afghan side is doing its utmost to help the UN observers to successfully carry out their mission.

Unfortunately, not only has the Pakistani side not taken measures to implement a number of provisions of the Geneva agreements but it is doing the complete opposite. The Pakistani authorities have been putting every possible obstacle in the way of the refugees intent on returning home.

Despite the Geneva agreements, Pakistan has taken a number of steps which can only be characterized as provocative and aimed at interference in Afghanistan's affairs, the Afghan Foreign Ministry spokesman stated. These actions are viewed throughout the world as unfriendly and contrary to the norms of international law.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that thanks to Afghanistan's positive approach, the UN observers have been able to visit a number of regions in the country as they wished. In particular, they followed the withdrawal of Soviet troops in Jalalabad, Gardeyz, Herat, Towraghondi, and Hayraton. However, the UN representatives in Pakistan have been unable to carry out their mission properly because of the authorities' opposition.

Afghan Premier Sharq Thanks Ryzhkov for Greeting

PM2206095588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1

[Undated message from Afghan Prime Minister M.H. Sharq to USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov]

[Text] To His Excellency N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Your Excellency.

Please accept my profound gratitude for your congratulations on my appointment as Prime Minister of the Republic of Afghanistan.

I am firmly convinced that the traditional, historical, friendly relations and all-around fruitful cooperation between our countries, based on good-neighborliness, mutual understanding, and respect, will continue to develop for the good of the peoples of both states and play an important role in ensuring peace and stability in the region and throughout the world. Our people are fully resolved to continue their efforts to implement the policy of national reconciliation so as to ensure lasting peace in the country.

I should like to take this opportunity to express my sincere wishes for health and prosperity to you and for great successes to the Government and the people of the friendly Soviet Union in the cause of socioeconomic development based on the policy of restructuring and in their activity for the good of world peace.

Doctor Muhammad Hasan Sharq, Prime Minister of the Republic of Afghanistan.

Taking of Hostages Condemned; Iranian Link Seen

PM2206111988 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Sergey Bulantsev: "Prisoners of Secret Dungeons. On the Fate of Terry Anderson and the Other Hostages"]

[Text] "Terry, my life, today—7 June—was Sulome's third birthday, darling. Her only wish is to see you and to be with you. She wants you to sing her 'Happy Birthday.' She loves you very much, Terry, and she knows that you love her too and want to be with her, but that it's not possible at the moment. She is good and patient and we also have to be patient, dear.

"I pray that you know just how much you mean to me, Terry. I live for the day when the Lord will hear our prayers and we can be together again. I love you very much, I love every beat of your heart. Until we meet again. Madeleine."

The enormous suffering, love, and hope in this letter will be more meaningful to our readers if we explain a few things.

The writer of the letter, which was published a few days ago in Beirut newspapers, was the American Madeleine Anderson. Her husband Terry Anderson, chief of the AP Near East Bureau, was kidnapped in Beirut 16 April 1985 and since then has been held hostage by pro-Iranian "Islamic fundamentalists" from the "Islamic Holy War" organization ("Al-Jihad al-Islami"). Three years ago his wife gave birth to a daughter whom Terry has never seen. And there is no guarantee that they will ever meet. The religious fanatics who kidnapped Terry and the other hostages by no means consider life to be the holy gift of Allah; murder of entirely innocent people has become customary for them.

Madeleine Anderson's letter is a cry of desperation and fading hope. At her request the letter was published in several Beirut newspapers. Madeleine hopes that it will be read by her husband's captors and—who knows?—the terrorists who have been detaining Terry for 3 years may suddenly have a heart and show him his wife's letter....

Terry Anderson is the most "senior" of the hostages seized in Beirut. In all, according to foreign news agency figures, there are currently 23 foreigners seized at different times, languishing in the secret dungeons of the "Islamic radicals."

Languishing... This word does not reflect the conditions under which the captives are being held. Here is testimony from the American Father Lawrence Jenko, who was held for 564 days, after which, for some unknown reason, he was released—emaciated, dirty, and ill. For the first 6 months he was held alone, attached to a wall by a short chain, and blindfolded.

A recently freed French hostage said that during his imprisonment he had been repeatedly moved from place to place. How was this done? Bound hand and foot, blindfolded and gagged, he was moved in a metal box hidden in the bottom of a truck. Once at a road block the truck stood in the burning sun for several hours, and the prisoner virtually went mad with the heat and his thirst.

The fate which befell the passengers of the Kuwaiti airliner whose hijacking was recently covered in detail by the press was not much better. Innocent people were bound and beaten; they were not allowed to get out of their seats for days.

Death is by no means an abstract hypothetical possibility but a real prospect facing the hostages. There have been many casualties among them, including Arkadiy Katkov, secretary at the consular department of the Soviet Embassy in Lebanon, who together with another three of our staffers was kidnapped in West Beirut in the fall of 1985.

The practice of hostage-taking is loathsome, and those who resort to it are vile scum who know nothing of concepts such as honor, dignity, and morality. There is no justification for them, nor can there be. Trampling the dignity of innocent people, forcing them to suffer, and using sophisticated psychological torture and bestial conditions to push them to the brink of insanity—can any ends justify these sadistic means?! Only the fascists could have tortured a child or old woman in full view of captured underground workers in order to wring information from them about their comrades. But what about these modern versions?

It is hard to be entirely confident about naming the center from which these puppets, blindly devoted to left-wing and Islamic slogans, receive their orders to seize hostages. But there are facts which should be pondered before conclusions are drawn. Here are some of them:

The largest hostage-taking operation, which resulted in a long—444 days!—detention for the hostages was undoubtedly the occupation of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. On 4 November 1979, "Muslim student followers of the course of Imam Khomeyni" imprisoned 52 diplomats and embassy staffers. Readers will probably recall the conditions under which they were held.

Furthermore, foreign observers unanimously claim that "Al-Jihad al-Islami," which is responsible for the kidnapping and death of many hostages, is supported by the Iranian authorities. Incidentally, the much-publicized "Irangate" started with the U.S. Administration aiming to free its hostages in Lebanon by means of an immoral deal with terrorists.

Let us continue the list. If one believes the recent reports by the London TIMES and AFP, talks are currently being conducted with Iranian officials by the United States, Britain, and the FRG. The subject of the talks are those countries' hostages held in Lebanon by pro-Iranian groupings.

Finally, we recall the recent reports from a number of news agencies that the hijackers who seized the Kuwaiti aircraft obtained reinforcements of weapons and terrorists when they landed on Iranian territory....

I repeat: It is hard to draw definite conclusions from these reports, and if they do point to something, it is more to the direction in which to search rather than to a specific culprit.

...I have in my hands a photo of Terry Anderson taken last year by his captors and sent to the Beirut newspapers. The face is of a tough, courageous 40-year-old man with kind but sad eyes. It is a very tired face.

Hang in there, Terry! Know that we in Russia are also seized by pain and indignation when we try to imagine your torment and suffering. We believe that you have enough spiritual and physical strength to come through this hell and make it to the day when you will again be free to embrace Sulome and Madeleine.

One more thing, Terry. Your captors will certainly be punished. Human life and human dignity are supreme values, and nobody is allowed to flout them and get away with it.

Further on Visit by Algeria's Belhouchet

Arrival Reported

PM2206112988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Official Visit"]

[Text] Major General A. Belhouchet, member of the National Liberation Front Central Committee Politburo and chief of staff of the Algerian National People's Army, arrived on an official visit to the Soviet Union 15 June.

The guest and the officials accompanying him were met at Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; and other officials.

M. Yala, Algerian ambassador to the USSR; and S. Ghadban, defense attache at the Algerian Embassy in the USSR, were among the welcoming party.

An honor guard was drawn up at the airport and the two countries' national anthems were played.

Dobrynin Meeting Reported

PM2106142188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Friendly Meeting"]

[Text] On 16 June A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with A. Belhouchet, member of the Algerian National Liberation Front [FLN] Politburo, deputy national defense minister, and chief of staff of the Algerian National People's Army.

The conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, expressed mutual satisfaction at the high level of Soviet-Algerian relations and the conviction that the process of restructuring in the USSR and of reform under way in Algeria are creating favorable conditions for broadening and deepening the mutually advantageous and equitable cooperation betweeen the two states. The participants in the meeting exchanged information on the tasks which the CPSU and the FLN are resolving at the present stage.

A thorough exchange of opinions took place on topical questions of the international situation and the situation in the Near and Middle East and in the Arab Maghreb, which showed that the sides' positions on these questions continue to coincide or are close. The importance and fruitfulness of the cooperation between the USSR and Algeria and between the CPSU and the FLN for ensuring the effectiveness of efforts aimed at preserving peace, at disarmament, and at the political solution of global and regional problems were pointed out.

S.F. Akhromeyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff, and USSR first deputy defense minister, and K.N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, took part in the conversation.

M.H. Yala, member of the FLN Central Committee and Algerian ambassador to the USSR, attended the meeting.

Visits Leningrad

PM2106153988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jun 88 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "On a Tour of the Country"]

[Text] On 17 June, Major General A. Belhouchet, member of the National Liberation Front Central Committee Politburo and chief of staff of the National People's Army of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, who is on an official visit to the Soviet Union, left Moscow on a tour of the country.

The guest from Algeria is being accompanied on the tour by Colonel General D. Grinkevich, chief of the Main Staff and first deputy commander in chief of the Ground Forces.

Major General A. Belhouchet arrived in Leningrad the same day. He was met at Pulkovo Airport by Lieutenant General V. Achalov, chief of staff of Leningrad Military District, and by other officials.

The guest from Algeria called on the district chief of staff, laid flowers at the monument to "The Heroic Defenders of Leningrad" in Victory Square, and visited Piskarevskoye Memorial Cemetery and other historical sites in the city.

On 18 June Major General A. Belhouchet, member of the National Liberation Front Central Committee Politburo and chief of staff of the National People's Army of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, who is on an official visit to the Soviet Union, visited the

Artillery Marshal V.I. Kazakov Central Artillery Officer Courses in Leningrad. The guest from Algeria familiarized himself with the training process and met with course teachers and students.

Sees Yazov, Leaves for Home

PM2206115188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Jun 88 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Visit Over"]

[Text] On 20 June, Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, received Major General A. Belhouchet, member of the National Liberation Front Central Committee Politburo and chief of staff of the National People's Army of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, who was paying an official visit to the Soviet Union.

Questions of mutual interest were discussed during the talks. Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and M. Yala, Algerian ambassador to the USSR, also participated in the meeting.

The talks were held in a friendly atmosphere.

Major General A. Belhouchet left Moscow for home 20 June.

The guest from Algeria was seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and by generals and officers of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The send-off party included M. Yala, Algerian ambassador to the USSR.

Soviet, Arab 'Representatives' Discuss Mideast

LD2106203488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Soviet and Arab representatives have discussed prospects for achieving peace in the Middle East in light of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Taking part in today's discussion were senior staff members of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Foreign Ministry, scientists, and Soviet and Arab journalists.

It was noted that the USSR's creative search for new ways of solving international problems, including the Middle East problem, was being conducted on the basis of staying faithful to the principled policy of supporting the Arab people's legitimate cause. The Soviet state shows flexibility and realism, thanks to which its actions are yielding positive results. This was emphasized by the participants.

Sub-Saharan Africa

'Tensions' in Northern Somalia Viewed

LD1706132488 Moscow in English to Africa 2000 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Text] It was easy to foresee that, even after the agreement on normalizing relations with Ethiopia, that was on 3d April, the situation in the north of Somalia would not improve. President and the leader of the ruling Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party, Mohamed Siad Barre, is highly respected in his country. He is credited for the country's independent foreign policy, despite the treaty of 1980 permitting the United States the use of Berbera seaport and its runway, the longest on the African Continent. Mr Barre has also taken credit for his policy to invigorate the party and the revolution, a policy that has resulted in a shift for the better in farming and in education, and in increasing industrial production. Be that as it may, the antigovernment unrest in the north was predetermined. There is an official ban on talk about the country being divided into clans, but diplomats believe that the president of Somalia is shoring up his position by appointing members of his clan, (Marihan), to posts in the Army and the government. Now members of the Isaq clan in the north of Somalia are said to be displeased with such practices, and they compromise the bulk of the Somali National Movement, the opposition to the Siad Barre government. The region of Hargeisa, the country's second biggest city in the north, has been restive since the early eighties.

Practically the entire population of Somalia is linguistically and culturally homogeneous, and a division into clans has been complicating life and making the instability in the north a perennial problem. The tensions in the north of Somalia can be scaled down, but not by military means. If a solution to this old problem were found it would be to the good of Somalia's unity, for only if there is unity will the country be able to solve the difficult economic and social problems facing all Somalians. The country needs peace.

And, in conclusion, a curious statement bearing on the situation in Somalia. Djibouti's President, Hassan Gouled Aptidon, told a FRANCE PRESS AGENCY correspondent that Djibouti has no intention of turning into a home base for the Somali National Movement and Djibouti would not become a springboard from which neighboring Somalia would be harrassed and destabilized.

CPSU Delegation Begins Zimbabwe Visit

PM2106141988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: CPSU Delegation Departure"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by I.I. Skiba, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the CPSU Central Committee's Agriculture and Food

Industry Department, left Moscow for Harare at the invitation of the leadership of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front [ZANU-PF].

Yesterday the delegation arrived in Harare. It was greeted at the airport by N. Mawema, member of the ZANU-PF Central Committee and deputy secretary of ZANU-PF for ideological and cultural matters; A. Kabasa, deputy speaker of the Zimbabwe House of Assembly; and other officials.

Skiba Received by Mugabe

PM2106141388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "CPSU Delegation Received"]

[Text] Harare, 16 Jun—R. Mugabe, head of state and leader of the Zimbabwe African National Union—Patriotic Front [ZANU-PF], today received the CPSU delegation headed by I.I. Skiba, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of a CPSU Central Committee department, which is visiting here.

In the course of the conversation R. Mugabe, who is also chairman of the Nonaligned Movement, pointed out that the dynamism of Soviet foreign policy has facilitated positive changes in the international arena. The peace initiatives put forward by the USSR have made it possible to get the disarmament problem moving and the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed. Nonaligned countries express the hope that new concrete steps to reduce and completely eliminate nuclear weapons will follow this most important document, he stated.

The sides stressed the great significance of the CPSU-ZANU-PF protocol on cooperation signed during the CPSU delegation's visit, having noted the broad prospects for further development of Soviet-Zimbabwean ties in the political, economic, and other spheres.

U.S., RSA Sincerity in Peace Effort Questioned

MB2106093488 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1800 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Mikhail Pavlov]

[Text] The latest steps taken by Washington and Pretoria are a cause of great anxiety to the Angolan leadership. The matter in question is the mobilization of reservists announced in South Africa and the recent secret meeting of Chester Crocker, the U.S. assistant state secretary for African affairs, and the leader of the terrorist grouping UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola], Savimbi. Both took place on the eve of the regular four-sided meeting of the representatives of Angola, Cuba, the Republic of South Africa, and the United States, whose aim is to continue talks in search of ways of settling the problems of the South Africa. Luanda and Havana are sincerely ready to solve dire questions by diplomatic means, whereas Washington and Pretoria [word indistinct] by deeds and not by words, are using unlawful ways writes Mikhail Pavlov, correspondent of the Moscow newspaper, IZVESTIYA.

As a pretext for the mobilization of reservists, the South African (?war) department stated that the Cuban forces were allegedly in the south of Angola near the border with Namibia.

The position of Washington, too, hinders the achievement of peace in the south of Africa. The meeting of Crocker and Savimbi is also harming the efforts undertaken with the aim of halting the war in this region. According to the Angolan ambassador in Zambia, Luis Neto Kiambata, Savimbi is soon planning to again visit Washington. This seriously compromises the United States and its role in searching for peace in the region.

In his interview to the REUTER News Agency this Angola diplomat asserted that, with the blessing of the United States and the Republic of South Africa, the terrorist grouping is destroying the economic targets and killing defenseless people.

The IZVESTIYA correspondent says that the diplomats and foreign journalists accredited in Angola are one in their opinion that Washington and Pretoria are acting against the course of the peaceful solution of the entangled regional conflict in the south of Africa.

East Europe

Gerasimov Gives News Conference in Prague

AU2106115788 Prague VECERNI PRAHA in Czech 16 Jun 88 p 2

[Michal Kuzmiak report: "A Model Spokesman; G. Gerasimov in Prague"]

[Excerpt] When one of the best-known (and most popular) personalities of the USSR today—Gennadiy Gerasimov, spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs—obligingly posed with our newspaper in hand ("With VECERNI PRAHA, yes, I like it") on the way to a Prague news conference, we knew we had won. We knew that we could venture even onto the thin ice of "personal" questions.

But in the meantime the news conference had already started, and the attending journalists were informed by G. Gerasimov and N. Shishlin, deputy head of a CPSU Central Committee, about the following:

—The press center of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference will begin operating in Moscow on 23 June;

—Delegations of the fraternal parties have not been invited to the 19th CPSU party conference, but 110 journalists of the socialist and workers press from all over the world have been invited;

—After the end of the 19th CPSU party conference a complete stenographic record of the discussions will be published in Moscow;

—CEMA needs more glasnost, but that lies fully in our hands, because a CSSR citizen is in charge of the CEMA press center.

During the news conference G. Gerasimov again demonstrated the attributes that a spokesman should have—prompt responses, wit, and the ability to intimate but not to say. [passage omitted]

Honecker, Demichev Meeting Reported

LD2106151588 Moscow TASS in English 1453 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Berlin June 21 TASS—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, chairman of the GDR Council of State, received here today Petr Demichev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice-president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who heads the Soviet delegation at the international meeting for nuclear-free zones.

In a friendly conversation Erich Honecker spoke highly of the Soviet Union's support for the creation of nuclear-free zones, which is reaffirmed in the message of greetings from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the participants in the international meeting for nuclear-free zones and the preparedness expressed to grant appropriate guarantees to the states participating in them. He welcomed the Soviet delegation's active participation in the international meeting, which is evidence of the common wish to free the world from nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction.

Petr Demichev spoke highly of the convocation of the international meeting for nuclear-free zones, which he described as a timely and useful initiative of the GDR, as an expression of her active peaceable policy. This meeting stimulates dialogue between states and public forces of various orientations, gives powerful impulses to the fight for a world free from nuclear weapons.

Defense Minister Lushev Leaves for Hungary

PM2206115388 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Jun 88 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Left for Budapest"]

[Text] Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister, left Moscow for Budapest on an official visit 20 June.

Army General P.G. Lushev was seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact states' Joint Armed Forces.

The send-off party included Major General L. Varga, military and air attache at the Hungarian Embassy in the USSR.

Soviet Weekly To Be Published in Hungary

LD2106174488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1440 GMT 21 Jun 88

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Excerpt] [Kudrin] In various countries of the world, millions of people daily follow life in the Soviet Union, the progress of changes and our restructuring. News from Moscow is always welcome, particularly if it originates in the Soviet capital. Let us listen to a report by our correspondent in Budapest, Yevgeniy Shirokov:

[Shirokov] Many proposals have been made for the weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI to be published in Hungarian. [video shows Shirokov standing by a street newspaper kiosk; scene from a news conference] Now these wishes are being fulfilled and are taking the shape of concrete actions. According to an agreement which has just been concluded between the agency PECHAT I NOVOSTI and the Hungarian newspaper and journal publishers Lapkiado, the first edition of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, printed here in Budapest, will come out in the coming months.

Yegor Yakovlev, editor in chief of the weekly, responding to questions by Hungarian journalists, explained that the edition will be based on the Moscow edition but that it is being planned to regularly prepare special materials of particular interest for the Hungarian audience. The print run? This will be determined by the level of demand. Recently they have begun to publish the popular weekly in the FRG. They printed 50,000 copies of the first edition. The third edition was 140,000 copies. To all intents, the distribution of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Britain which has just begun, promises to develop at the same pace. [video shows Yakovlev holding up MOSCOW NEWS in English] This is what the Cologne and London editions look like. Thus, Hungarian is the seventh language in which the popular Soviet weekly—reflecting both our lifestyle and the essence of the profound transformations taking place in society—is to be published. [passage omitted]

Polish Sejm Session Replaces Foreign Minister

PM2106135988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Polish Sejm Session Ends"]

[Text] Warsaw, 18 Jun—The legal foundation for accelerating the further restructuring of the state structure and for fundamental positive changes in the economy within the framework of the implementation of the second stage of economic reform is provided by the package of laws adopted at the session of the Polish People's Republic Sejm which ended in Warsaw yesterday. Taking part in its work were Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State, and other leaders of the country.

The Polish Parliament's deputies approved amendments to the Constitution, which introduce provisions for the institution of communal property in the basic law. The Sejm also amended the Law on People's Councils and Territorial Self-Management and other legal acts regulating the activity of local organs of people's power and state administration. The modification of legislation is aimed at expanding the rights and powers of councils and consolidating their financial-economic base and independence.

A report by the government on the situation regarding public order in the country was read to the deputies by Poland's Minister of Internal Affairs C. Kiszczak. He noted that positive changes have now occurred in the struggle against crime, compared with the early eighties. The trend toward growth of crime has been halted and crime detection has increased. Alcohol consumption fell last year for the first time in the recent past. Touching on the local strikes in Poland in late April and early May this year, C. Kiszczak said that the calls by their instigators for the social conflict to be fanned on a larger scale failed. The working people did not fall for the political opponents' slogans for the organization of illegal strikes which ruin the economy, aggravate market difficulties, and lead to higher inflation. The overwhelming majority of working people were in favor of continuing the process of social and economic reforms. The minister noted that many conflict situations could have been altogether avoided or defused had the leadership of individual enterprises, sectors, or higher education establishments heeded peoples' voices and their requests and aspirations.

The session effected changes in the leadership of the Sejm and of Poland's government. J. Biedrzycka and M. Rakowski were relieved of duties as vice marshals of the Sejm. Elzbieta Gacek and T. Porebski were appointed to these positions. The Sejm relieved M. Orzechowski from his duties as minister of foreign affairs and appointed T. Olechowski to this position.

Romanian Official Rebuked Over Chemicals Scandal

PM2106152788 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Dismissed"]

[Text] Bucharest, 18 Jun—At a regular session held here, the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee discussed reports on progress in agricultural work. The RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee also examined the results of an investigation into the illegal conclusion by Romanian foreign trade enterprises of a contract with the firm of Chimica-Liechtenstein for the storage of a large quantity of that firm's chemical and petrochemical industrial waste in the free port of Sulina. It was pointed out that the foreign firm violated Romanian laws, as well as international laws, by storing in the port waste which poses a danger to the population's health.

For a serious violation of the country's laws, abuse of official position, and irresponsibility it was decided also to release I. Vaduva from his duties as Romanian minister of foreign trade and international economic cooperation and S. Birlea from his duties as chairman of the Romanian State Planning Committee and to remove him from candidate membership of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee.

The RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee decided to administer a public reprimand to G. Oprea, first deputy prime minister of the Romanian Government; S. Andrei, deputy prime minister of the Romanian Government; and N.M. Ion, Romanian minister of the chemical and petrochemical industry. Romanian Interior Minister T. Postelnicu, Romanian Deputy Prime Minister N. Ibanescu, and Romanian Finance Minister G. Paraschiv were reprimanded. The RCP Central Committee Central Executive Committee rebuked C. Dascalescu, prime minister of the Romanian Government, who failed to ensure that urgent measures were taken to stop the storage of chemical waste.

Tula CPSU Chief Leads Delegation to SFRY

PM2106151188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU party officials headed by Yu.I. Litvintsev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Tula CPSU Obkom, was in Yugoslavia 13-18 June in accordance with the plan for ties. It familiarized itself with the LCY's activity on the implementation of the strategy for the country's economic and social development. It had meetings and conversations at the LCY Central Committee, the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Bosnia and Hercegovina, the SFRY Federal Planning Administration, and scientific institutions and enterprises. The delegation was received by K. Siroka, member of the LCY Central Committee Presidency.

West Europe

Positive Outcome of Greek-Turkish Talks Noted

LD2106151388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[Vladimir Potapov dispatch: "Dialogue Will Continue"]

[Text] Athens—Turkish Prime Minister T. Ozal's visit to the Greek capital is over. The 3-day talks between the leaders of the neighboring states, which were on the brink of a military conflict just 1 year ago, have been attentively followed by the local and international public.

As expected, the visit did not spring any surprises. Nobody, as Greek Prime Minister A. Papandreou put it, expected that the problems between Greece and Turkey would be resolved "with a wave of a magic wand." But at the same time, he noted, the overwhelming majority of Greeks advocate the development of peaceful dialogue with Turkey. And in this respect, to use A. Papandreou's words, as a result of the Athens meeting "there is light at the end of the tunnel" with regard to the Cyprus problem. As is well known, the complex relationship between the two countries has long been darkened by the Cyprus problem and attempts by NATO circles and the transatlantic ally to exploit tension in the Aegean islands for their own selfish ends.

For his part, the Turkish guest noted with satisfaction the atmosphere of "mutual understanding and respect at the talks" in Athens. The joint communique issued at the end of the visit expresses the intention of the Greek and Turkish Governments to promote the establishment of a climate of trust between the two peoples, welcomes the first steps in the work of the joint political and economic commissions set up somewhat earlier, and points to the connection between the development of economic cooperation and the growth of mutual trust.

In other words, we should expect a continuation of the Greek-Turkish dialogue.

Road Transportation Agreement Signed With Turkey

PM2106130888 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 Jun 88 p 3

[TASS report under the rubric "From the SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA Teletype": "Turkey"]

[Text] An intergovernmental agreement between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Turkey on international motor transport was signed here today. The document was signed by Yu.S. Sukhin, RSFSR minister of motor transport, and E. Pakdemirli, Turkish minister of transport and communications.

The agreement signed in Ankara provides for the development of motor passenger and freight transport between the two countries and transit through their territory.

Belgian CP Extraordinary Congress Held 18 Jun

PM2106151788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Extraordinary Congress"]

[Text] Brussels, 18 Jun—An extraordinary congress of the Belgian Communist Party [PCB], held here yesterday, examined several questions concerning amendments to the party statute.

PCB President Louis Van Geyt addressed delegates with an introductory speech. He noted in particular that federalist trends, conditioned by the existence of the two main communities, the Flemmish and the Francophone, have recently become widespread in the country. The new conditions, he emphasized, demand of Communists to take the situation into account and adopt a more flexible policy, including on the question of the party's structure.

Congress delegates approved the proposals by the special commission appointed by the PCB Central Committee concerning amendments to Article 15 of the party statute. According to the new version, the party retains unified organs (Central Committee and Central Committee Politburo) which will reflect the joint stance of the country's Communists on questions like the state's foreign policy and the problems of West European integration within the "Common Market's" framework, and will also maintain and develop the PCB's international ties.

At the same time, the congress adopted a decision on the structural formation of the party's three components—the Flemmish, Francophone, and Brussels sections. Speaking at a news conference, Louis Van Geyt pointed out that the amendment of the statute concerning party building represents a further development of the democratic principles of its activity.

The congress examined the candidates for chairmen of the party's new structural sections. Ludo Loose becomes president of the Flemmish Section, Robert Dussard of the Francophone Section, and Ann Erkovizi [name as published] of the Brussels Section. Louis Van Geyt takes up the office of PCB national president, with Claude Renard as his deputy.

Soviet Naval Squadron Arrives in Finland

LD2006222388 Moscow TASS in English 1859 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Text] Helsinki June 20 TASS—A Soviet naval squadron consisting of the training ship Smolny and the Oceanography Research Vessel Ivan Kruzenshtern arrivved here today for an official friendly visit. The squadron is led by Admiral Vladimir Samoylov, commander of the Leningrad naval base.

The visit of the Soviet Navy ships is being made in the year of the 40th anniversary of the treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance between the USSR and the Republic of Finland. People of Finland show a lively interest in the programme of the visit.

Soviet, Norwegian Fisheries Ministers Confer

LD2106190488 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—New measures aimed at the restoration of the stocks of cod in the Barents and Norwegian Seas were mapped out at the talks between

USSR Minister of Fisheries Nikolay Kotlyar and Norway's Minister of Fisheries Bjarne Mork Eidem held here today. It was decided to reduce the quotas for cod fishing for both countries. The new quotas are planned to be agreed upon before the conclusion of the Norwegian minister's visit to the USSR. He is to visit the Soviet Far East and Leningrad.

In an interview to a TASS correspondent Bjarne Mork Eidem described the Soviet-Norwegian cooperation in fisheries as fruitful and mutually advantageous and based on scientific research. The scientists of the two countries now, specifically, consider the proposal of the Norwegian side to increase the minimal size of mesh in fishing nets used in cod fishing. The sides coordinate the estimates of the population of seals in the Barents and Norwegian Seas. It turned out that these animals hamper coastal fishing by Norwegian seamen. The scientists will be striving to prepare their proposals on these and a number of other matters by the next session of the joint commission on fisheries planned for November.

Touching upon the prospects for the deepening of cooperation in fisheries Bjarne Mork Eidem pointed to the mutual interest that the organizations of the two countries show in joint enterprise. Concrete projects have not yet been worked out in this area, but joint ventures are likely to be set up in the years ahead, the Norwegian minister said.

Political & Social

Protests Continue Over Nagorno-Karabakh
AU2206103588 Paris AFP in English 1033 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 22 (AFP)—Tens of thousands of protesters gathered for the second consecutive day on Wednesday in Stepanakert, capital of the Nagorno-Karabakh region of the Azerbaijan Republic, demanding the enclave's return to Armenia, a local television station spokesman told AFP. In a telephone interview, the spokesman added that the protesters had criticized a resolution passed on Tuesday by the Nagorno-Karabakh Soviet, or parliament, calling for the provisional removal of the region from Azerbaijan jurisdiction. The protesters charged that the measure, which Nagorno-Karabakh parliamentary deputies said was necessary to improve the "stability" of the area, was insufficient, the spokesman said.

Meanwhile, a general strike continued in Stepanakert and several other towns in Nagorno-Karabakh, and only food stores remained open.

The demonstrators also called on the Soviet press to publish an account of Tuesday's session of the Nagorno-Karabakh parliament, which virtually all Soviet newspapers failed to do in Wednesday's editions. Analysts said that Tuesday's action by the Nagorno-Karabakh parliament was probably part of an interim solution for the region, pending a decision by the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union on the disputed territory.

The presence at Tuesday's Nagorno-Karabakh parliamentary session of Suleyman Tatliyev, leader of Azerbaijan's Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the republic's highest legislative body, likely played a role in the parliament's appeal, the analysts said. But Mr. Tatliyev's participation in the meeting, accompanied by warnings to Nagorno-Karabakh deputies on the consequences of their votes, were seen by most Armenians as unfair "pressure," sources in Stepanakert said.

Armenian nationalist Igor Muradyan said a call to the assembly by the Soviet general in charge of troops in the Azerbaijan city of Sumgait when anti-Armenian violence broke out last February was perceived in a similar light. The officer, named as General Krayev, said Nagorno-Karabakh should not "break its traditional ties of friendship" with Baku, the Azerbaijan capital.

According to official figures, 32 persons were killed and more than 200 injured in Sumgait during three days of anti-Armenian rioting which was officially described as a "pogrom." The assembly Tuesday said that those responsible, currently being tried in Baku, should be dealt with by the Soviet Union's Supreme Court.

Meanwhile, a call by the Nagorno-Karabakh parliament for striking workers to return to their jobs was largely ignored Wednesday, the television spokesman said. "The situation is catastrophic," the spokesman said. He added that the strike, which began over a month ago, was continuing throughout the region.

On Friday, the Azerbaijan parliament rejected a resolution passed in Nagorno-Karabakh on February 20 calling for the Armenian-dominated enclave to be transferred to Armenia. It was ceded to Azerbaijan under Stalin in 1923. A week ago, the Armenian parliament approved by unanimous vote a resolution which called for the reincorporation of Nagorno-Karabakh into Armenia.

'Wisdom, Tact' Cool 'Passions' in Yerevan
PM2106152188 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 22 Jun 88 p 3

["Topical Reportage" by "our special correspondents" N. Ordinyan and Yu. Kozlovskiy: "When Passions Abate; Armenia's Enterprises Are Embarking on the Elimination of Economic Losses From Absenteeism"]

[Text] Yerevan—It was probably the hardest day in the life of Genrikh Babkenovich Badeyan. As he approached the plant on the morning of 13 June, the general director of the "Zakavkazkabel" Production Association saw a crowd of people at the entrance. Over 1,500 Yerevan cable men had declared a strike and were now on their way to the city's Teatralnaya Square.

Badeyan rushed to the plant and toured the unusually quiet shops. What was he thinking of?

"Just that I shouldn't do anything unnecessary," Genrikh Babkenovich said. "I was thinking above all that one day's stoppage would cost the association dear. Of our four production facilities, three operate continuously. The enameling units would have to be brought up to operating condition. Of course, I had calculated what the stoppages of the rail cars would cost. Until then we had not paid the railroad a single kopek in fines."

We were talking with the director on 17 June, and as of that day, the enterprise was lagging behind in production output to the tune of R1,643,000. Yet before 13 June the cable men had been overfulfilling the plan respectably.

"You must try to understand us," Badeyan continued. "Since 20 February, when the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies extraordinary session lodged the appeal with which you are familiar with the Armenian and Azerbaijan Supreme Soviets, we have also had enough unsettled days. Why conceal the fact that there were also days when people were called to attend meetings and not to work? But we persuaded people: 'Don't give in to your emotions. If you want to go to a demonstration and submit your view of the problem—that is your legal constitutional right. But you cannot attend meetings at the expense of your work.'"

"Yes," D. Isagulyan, party committee secretary, says, "that is exactly how it all happened. The director, foundry hand V. Vanyan, wire drawer Yu. Simanyan, enamel workers team leader B. Mkhitaryan, and I were sent to the shops and sectors and spoke simple, comprehensible words to people about how our output goes to all republics of the country, about how we have about 3,000 clients. Without power cables, the production of petroleum immersion pumps will break down, and the nondelivery of magnet, enameled, and lighting wires will seriously complicate the construction of new electric power lines and electric locomotives. Why, we asked, must other enterprises lose their rhythm and workers their wages because of us? Yes, we have democracy. But not anarchy. People trusted us and trust us now. And you had better ask the workers themselves why they went not to the plant but to Teatralnaya Square on 13 June."

This talk ended on Friday evening. On the morning of Saturday, 18 June, we were at the cable plant again. The director guided us around the modernized shops and, without concealing his pride, showed us the modern equipment, the new canteen building with its enormous Italian windows and walls finished with fine Armenian felsite. Then we saw the 50-meter heated swimming pool and the vines on the plant's territory. And sweet cherry and apple trees. The enterprise has 30 hectares of territory, and on a good one-third, the workers have planted orchards, laid out rose gardens, and installed fountains.

Unfortunately, it is not often that you meet this kind of thing on the territory of an industrial enterprise and remember it for a long time after seeing it. But we remembered even better the people with whom we met and talked here. We talked about various things. Crane operator A. Agasyan was worried about his son Artur. The latter was serving in the Army with an Azerbaijani boy from Baku. They love each other like brothers, but they rarely meet now. D. Lobyan, leader of a team of armoring workers, lives in Shamshadinskiy Rayon, which is next to Tauzskiy Rayon. "My father," Lobyan says, "has many Azerbaijani friends there. I also have acquaintances. They used to come to our house and spend the night with us. There were normal, human relations. Surely we cannot lose that?"

These people were saying nothing unusual. They wanted one thing—clarity.

"But why, for what reason," shift foreman G. Sosiyan said with emotion, "has virtually nothing been reported about how the trial in Sumgait is proceeding? Why have they taken so much time in the republic to examine the petition from the session of Karabakh people's deputies? People gathered on Teatralnaya Square to demand that their deputies immediately put this question on the agenda of the next Armenian Supreme Soviet. And on 13 June, 2 days before the session began its work, we decided to come with this demand once more."

Teatralnaya Square became the center of events in the city in the middle of June. Thousands of Yerevan people came there every day. What speakers did not address them from the steps of the opera building! Those who began to talk rubbish were driven away with concerted whistling. Sensible words were met with understanding.

On 13 June S. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, mounted the theater steps. There was a frank talk between the republic's party leader and the people. First of all, S. Arutyunyan read out the draft decree of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet. Then he spoke about how people must stop at least for an instant and try to rid themselves at least for a moment of their overwhelming emotions and think soberly, compare their outbursts with the present-day realities and the tasks facing the country. Later, speaking from the session platform, the first secretary would say yet again how necessary today are the common sense, restraint, high civic responsibility, and political realism of those who hold dear the republic's honor and dignity.

Passions in the city have now abated. People realize that they cannot succumb only to emotions and believe rumors. They understand and are openly saying in Yerevan that many other problems—economic, social, and moral—have accumulated in the republic.

Of course, there are also people who dislike this sober and businesslike approach toward resolving the problem. But now you cannot hear calls for strikes, you cannot see night time street processions or meetings in front of the buildings of party and state organs. Wisdom and tact are beginning to prevail in people's mood and conduct. The republican newspaper KOMMUNIST has published an appeal from the labor collective councils of the city's industrial enterprises that all the Saturdays in June should be worked in order to make up for what has been omitted. A good and necessary initiative. After all, in Yerevan's Leninskiy Rayon alone, 25 out of 49 enterprises were not working on 13 June.

"But how," we ask G. Shirinyan, chairman of the "Zakavkazkabel" Labor Collective Council, "do the cable men intend to eliminate the lag?"

"The council has come out with the proposal to work overtime on Saturday and Sunday. And people have understood us correctly. For instance, the rolling mill operators should work until 1600 hours but will leave the plant at 1900-2000 hours."

"And at our facility," G. Smbatyan, chief of the magnet wire and power cable production facility and honored rationalizer of the Armenian SSR, says, "the workers themselves, the heat-treaters, wire drawers, and armoring workers, without waiting for calls or appeals, organized a third shift under the two-shift system, and you should see how they are working. We were in arrears to the tune of 30 tonnes of aluminum wire, 20 tonnes of magnet wire, and 35 km of armored cable for 13 June. Today we are coping in full with the plan and will produce 20 tonnes of output over and above it. I will put it to you this way," Gevorg Asaturovich concluded his brief monologue, "we will not let the country down."

Well, his words did not deviate from his deeds, as they say. On Saturday 205,000 people worked at 120 of the republic's enterprises. They produced output worth over R10 million.

In the evening, having completed this reportage, we walked through the city streets. An elderly Armenian was taking his grandson home from the park, trying to persuade him to go to bed on time. Lovers were kissing on a bench in the public garden. On Teatralnaya Square, students on the steps of the opera were singing songs.

Health, Social Security Commissions Meet in Baku

NC2106064588 Baku International Service in Azeri 1200 GMT 18 Jun 88

[Text] The Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Permanent Commissions for Health Services and Social Security convened yesterday, hearing a report on the work of the Republic's Health Ministry to improve medical services for the rural people.

The meeting noted that a large number of new preventive medicine centers have been opened in the republic in the past few years and that another 70 clinics and (?hospitals) will be made available in the near future. A number of recommendations were made for the supply of medical equipment and pharmaceutical drugs to the health centers and for the appointment of highly qualified medical experts.

The decision adopted by the two commissions advised the pertinent organs to take the necessary measures to eliminate shortages, provide work opportunities and livelihood services for women, protect mothers and children, and successfully realize the demands of the law calling for the protection of the environment.

New Estonian 'Popular Front' Movement Described

LD2206091488 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 0500 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Excerpts] Tallinn—In Estonia, which has a new party leader, the expectations of citizens are high. A citizens' movement was quickly set up to interpret the new thoughts. The movement calls itself the Estonian Popular Front To Support Perestroyka. But in the streets the people's thoughts are even more radical than the aims which the Popular Front has revealed. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent Hannu Vilpponen] The new popular front does not want to go as far as many people I met on the street want it to go. It does not want to throw out the Russians living in Estonia, and it does not want to separate Estonia from the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the Popular Front To Support Perestroyka is a popular organization approved by the governing party leadership, an organization which wants to develop Estonia as an independent part of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Constitution says that all Soviet republics are independent parts of the federal state, but in practice, so far, both in economics as in other sectors of the society, even in small matters, the power to make decisions lies with Moscow.

The new Popular Front wants the Estonians to decide for themselves what they produce and where they sell their products, but it wants to leave the common foreign policy and defense policy to the central leadership. In these thoughts the Popular Front also has the support of the ruling Communist Party of Estonia. Last night, I met with the president of Estonia, officially the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Arnold Ryuytel, who said that the Soviet Union is such a big country that its economy can only be succesfully developed on the basis of regional independence.

In addition to economic independence, the Estonians want, among other things, to have Estonian as the official language of the country, which in practice means that the officials must know both Russian and Estonian, and in order to increase national identity they want to start using the (?independent) blue-black-white flag of Estonia to be used in parallel with the official red flag which symbolizes the federal state.

Although the new Popular Front has quickly gathered (?a huge number) of Estonians—last Friday, for instance, it brought 150,000 people to the Tallinn song festival to (?see off) the party congress delegates—it is still only a scattered popular organization and not a party or an organizational machine, nor does it want to take part in political decision making itself. But according to the activists of the Popular Front, it has already achieved the fact that not one of the Stalinists still in the party leadership dares to act against the perestroyka they are supporting. According to the opinions of the Estonians I met yesterday, the Popular Front also has the support of the new party leader, Vayno Vyalyas. However, he has not (?explained) his political line. This is Hannu Vilpponen in Tallinn.

New Estonian First Secretary Vyalyas Interviewed

PM2106184188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with V.I. Vyalyas, newly elected first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, by ETA correspondent A. Prisyazhnyy, especially for IZVESTIYA, under the rubric "Names and Events": "Heading Estonia's Communists"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] As has been reported, an Estonian Communist Party Central Committee plenum held a few days ago elected Vayno Iosipovich Vyalyas first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

He was born in 1931 on Khiyumaa Island and is an Estonian, a party member since 1952, a graduate of Tartu State University, and a candidate of historical sciences. He was first secretary of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee. He headed the Tallinn party organization. In 1971 he was elected secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. In 1980 he was appointed USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Venezuela, and afterward to the Republic of Nicaragua.

[Prisyazhnyy] The brief lines of a biographical sketch do not offer anything like a full picture of your life. Tell us, what stands behind them....

[Vyalyas] I was born in a poor family. People in Estonia say that women on Khiyumaa Island do the work of three people. My mother was really like that. And she strove to bring me up accordingly. My father, like many of the islanders, fished the sea. The Soviet power which was restored in 1940 gave land to my parents, but they died soon after the war. Therefore, I had to combine study with work. In the postwar years people like me, offspring of poor families, had no doubts as to the path to be taken. I joined the Komsomol, and later on the party. I have especially warm memories of my youth in the Komsomol and my studies in one of our oldest universities in Tartu. While I was a student I was secretary of the Tartu State University Estonian Komsomol Committee, then secretary of the Tartu Estonian Komsomol Obkom, then first secretary of the Tartu Estonian Komsomol Gorkom, and in my fifth year I was elected first secretary of the republic Komsomol Central Committee. This was good schooling for party work. I was elected first secretary of the Tallinn Gorkom, then secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. Since 1980 I have been on diplomatic duties.

[Prisyazhnyy] Until Nicaragua, between 1980 and 1986, you represented our country in Venezuela and were nonresident envoy to Trinidad and Tobago. Your work in Venezuela earned you that country's highest decoration, the Libertador Order, which enjoys a special status: It is awarded for outstanding services to the people of Venezuela and to mankind. It has been awarded to just a handful of foreigners....

[Vyalyas] During those years our countries started to confidently advance along the path of joint cooperation in the most diverse spheres: Bilateral commodity turnover increased, there were exchanges of parliamentary delegations, cultural contacts were stepped up. Points of contact were discovered on a whole series of international problems, including the settlement of the situation in Central America.

[Prisyazhnyy] The Central Committee plenum was preceded by conversations with republic leaders and Communists representing the intelligentsia, the working class, and the rural workers. The question was: Who is best suited to lead Estonian's party organization in today's conditions? And the overwhelming majority named you. Consequently, despite an absence of 8 years, people remember you and esteem you. What was the cause of such substantial changes in your career, of your transfer to diplomatic work?

[Vylayas] I think that you had better ask those who posted me there. But probably my experience in Komsomol and party work was also taken into account. I represented the country on several occasions as a member of Komosmol, party, and parliamentary delegations. As a matter of fact, the ties which were established then helped in the most unexpected fashion as a diplomat.

[Prisyazhnyy] What will be the new first secretary's first job?

[Vyalyas] Familiarization with the situation in the republic. Many events have occurred here in the recent past, and my primary concern is to get my bearings. From afar, I followed the republic's life in the press, reading the newspapers from their "masthead" right through to the publication data, but how can you get the full picture from isolated articles?

[Prisyazhnyy] What do you consider to be of paramount importance now?

[Vylayas] Everything is of paramount importance for a first secretary. I simply have no right to deliver program speeches.

[Prisyazhnyy] If you were to have an opportunity to address the 19th all-union party conference, what proposals would you make from the rostrum?

[Vyalyas] They are outlined in the draft republic platform. This is a unique document. It can be said that it was elaborated by the whole people. Conference delegates assembled repeatedly to discuss it, and it was published in the press. It includes the ideas and wishes of the most diverse strata of the population, public movements and groups. They include the People's Front for Restructuring, the Greens, the creative unions, and youth organizations. Some 2-3 years ago, the creation and broad discussion of such a document would have been simply unimaginable.

[Prisyazhnyy] We are not all that accustomed to discussing political figures' private lives. Would you nevertheless allow me to depart from this tradition....

[Vyalyas] Why not.... I'm married, and we have two children. While I was working abroad my children were left on their own and they studied at my beloved "alma mater." They have become totally independent, something which I particularly value in young people nowadays. My son followed in my footsteps and is a historian. He teaches in one of Tallinn's schools. My daughter is a pediatrician.

My wife is a teacher. She was of great help to me in Venezuela and Nicaragua, especially in the establishment and development of cultural ties. While in Nicaragua she looked after children, especially those who had lost their parents. She visited orphanages and took part in the work of various women's associations. She distributed clothing, food, toys, and textbooks sent as gifts from Soviet people to the Nicaraguans.

[Prisyazhnyy] Imagine that you had an hour or two of free time. How would you spend it?

[Vyalyas] First of all, I would like to spend even a little of it with my family. Then with books. I am an avid reader. I had some time to read the periodical press while abroad, but not always time for literature. And of course, the theater, cinema, and concerts. There are exhibitions to be visited. I dream of getting out into nature. I cannot imagine a mental balance without forests and sea. I believe that environmental protection is an important civic duty. As a historian, I intend to participate as much as possible in the preservation of the people's memory and the safeguarding of antiquity.

Tallinn Residents Polled on New First Secretary

LD2006220288 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Text] The Central Committee of Estonia's Communist Party held a full-scale meeting in Tallinn recently and elected a new first secretary, Vayno Vyalyas. Prior to that, Vayno Vyalyas served as the Soviet ambassador to Nicaragua. Members of the sociological service, functioning in the framework of the local radio and television, decided to find out what the people of Tallinn thought about the change in Estonia's party leadership. The day following the full-scale meeting they questioned Tallinn residents at random by telephone. Our Tallinn correspondent Oleg Bogulovskiy asked the initiator of the poll, the leader of the sociological service, (Andreas Saar), to tell him about the results of the venture.

We spent 3 hours questioning 467 Tallinn residents who we contacted at their places of work, (Andreas Saar) says. They included 331 Estonians and 136 people of other nationalities. Here are the results:

Among the Estonians, 74 percent of those questioned believed that the situation in the republic will improve following the election of the new first secretary of Estonia's Communist Party. Among the representatives of other nationalities, 54 percent shared this belief, and 39 percent found it difficult to express their viewpoint, knowing, unlike their Estonian counterparts, too little about Vayno Vyalyas. This is natural because the Estonians are liable to know Vayno Vyalyas better than the representatives of other ethnic groups.

And are there people who believe that life in Estonia might get worse as a result of the change in the party leadership? continues (Andreas Saar). No. There were no such people among the Estonians. Among the representatives of other ethnic groups, pessimists made up 2 percent. The questions asked by the pollsters included the following ones: What program of action must the new first secretary of Estonia's Communist Party have? And what problems must he resolve first of all?

It has transpired that the Estonians and the people of other nationalities have different approaches to this issue, (Andreas Saar) says; 39 percent of the Estonians declared that Vayno Vyalyas must deal specifically with the problem of Estonia's economic self-sufficiency. The other main problems mentioned by the Estonians were relations between different ethnic groups that had noticeably aggravated in the republic recently; also, food supplies, the need to replace leading party officials and the need to reduce the migration of labor force to Estonia from other Soviet republics, as well as environmental protection. The representatives of Tallinn's non-Estonian population named the problem of ethnic relations as the major one, (Andreas Saar) goes on to say. Relations between different ethnic groups must be improved, they said. The non-Estonians said that the problems of food and consumer goods supplies were second and third in importance respectively. They also mentioned the problem of environmental protection. Most of those questioned recommended the Central Committee of Estonia's Communist party to consult the people more often, to take public opinion into account.

I believe that the major result of our poll, (Andreas Saar) says in conclusion, is that it displayed full support for the policy of restructuring on the part of both Estonian and non-Estonian population of the republic.

Estonian Party Conference Platform Described

LD2106213488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with B.G. Tamm, director of Tallinn Polytechnical Institute and academician of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, by correspondent H. Lenk in Estonia; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Lenk] The republican newspapers have just published the main points of the platform with which Estonia's delegates will go to the 19th all-union part conference. The broadest possible sections of the public took part in drafting the platform.

[Tamm] Every line of the document you mention is of course the creation of all our part organizations, of the whole people. The platform of the delegates of the Estonian Communist Party fully approves and is based on the theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th party conference. But at the same time, it reflects certain special features of our republic which, of course, require a somewhat specialized approach. An important place is occupied in the document by economic questions. We think it expedient to carry out Estonia's transition to economic self-government and financial autonomy. It is thus necessary, of course, to be released from the incompetent guardianship of all kinds of Union Departments, and to subordinate the industry that is located on our republic's territory to our Estonian Council of Ministers. I think analogous problems occur in other regions in our country. From this flows, in turn, the need to more precisely define the status of the union republics and to return to Lenin's idea of a union of equal, sovereign republics. The platform of our republic's delegates has of course been approved now, approved by all the people; a characteristic example of this approval was the recent 17 June mass meeting on Pevcheskoye Pole, the famous Pevcheskoye Pole in Tallinn.

[Lenk] This meeting was attended by more than 100,000 people. It was addressed by delegates, republic party leaders, workers, teachers, and rural workers. Representatives of different towns and districts in the republic came to the meeting with slogans, the content of which is expressed in the words: Estonia firmly supports radical continuation of restructuring.

Latvian Demonstrators Support Autonomy

AU2106160388 Paris AFP in English 1508 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 21 (AFP)—Demonstrators recently took to the streets of Riga, the capital of the Soviet Baltic Republic of Latvia, to protest attempts by the local Communist Party to quash a debate on calls for greater autonomy, a dissident source said Tuesday. About 400 people gathered on Sunday outside the Latvian Communist Party headquarters to protest its resolution condemning "extremists" who allegedly attempted to turn an anti-Stalin demonstration on June 14 into an "anti-Soviet" protest, according to Mikhail Bombin, Riga correspondent for the EXPRESS-KHRONIKA bulletin.

The June 14 demonstration, attended by some 40,000 people, was called to commemorate the victims of mass deportations ordered by Stalin in 1941 and 1949. The demonstration had been called by both unofficial groups and by the Communist Youth organisation.

According to Mr. Bombin, speakers who addressed the demonstrators pledged support for a resolution earlier adopted by a meeting of Latvian intellectuals which called for real autonomy for the state, annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940. Part of the Communist Party's Central Committee was said to have endorsed the resolution which was published in the local media. On June 18, a full meeting of the party's Central Committee apparently had a change of heart and termed "irresponsible" those "journalists and Communists" who had publicized the resolution.

On Sunday, the demonstrators also condemned what they termed were attempts by the party Central Committee to "pit Russians against Latvians," Mr. Bombin said. A number of "provocative anti-Russian" leaflets had suddenly appeared in Riga, he added.

Lithuanian Anthem, Flag at Vilnius Protest

LD2206101788 Vilnius in English to North America 2220 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Excerpts] Forty-seven years ago a wave of Stalinist repressions hit Lithuania. Going by present-day available data 12,500 Lithuanians were deported to remote areas in the Soviet Union in 1941.

It was namely these spiritual wounds that brought people from all over Lithuania into one of the central squares of Vilnius near the splendid building of the cathedral, a magnificent example of Lithuanian calssic architecture. Taking part in this event were several hundred people. Various newspapers gave different estimates as to the exact number of participants. But the most convincing report places the demonstrators at 500.

Although the city authorities consented to the demonstration, no official call was voiced. Our correspondent was told by the participants that they got to know about the event from the Lithuanian language broadcasts beamed by Vatican Radio and Voice of America. For the fourth time since last August Western radio stations have been instrumental in turning out demonstrators in Vilnius at a given time and place. The local authorities banned two of these demonstrations earlier that no official permission had been issued. [passage omitted]

The second speaker urged the demonstrators to sing the national Lithuanian hymn, written 90 years ago. Up to the year 1950 it was also the national anthem of Soviet Lithuania. But since it was closely associated with bourgeois Lithuania it was dropped, and for several decades its performance in public was both undesirable and impossible. However, the major changes now underway in this country have made it possible for the once popular hymn to make a comeback to our spiritual life. [passage omitted]

Soon after came yet another attribute of prewar Lithuania, the flag of the Lithuanian Republic, which still is not publicly tolerated. Newspaper reports show that the man who hoisted the flag was Leonas Laurinskas, a former member of an armed underground anti-Soviet grouping. For the crimes he committed during the period ranging from 1946 to 1953 Leonas Laurinskas was sentenced to long years of imprisonment. Half an our later the falg was lowered as the demonstrators resorted to merely one symbolic feature characteristic of similar events, that is, black bands and ribbons, a symbol of fair mourning.

One speaker changed another. [sentence as heard] The most active of them was a dissident group known for its conflicts with the authorities in the past. Only when the speakers began to deviate from the main subject matter and focus on religious issues and Molotov-Ribbentrop treaty, events in Nagorno-Karabakh, and Afghanistan conflicts, the city mayor Algirdas Vileikis made a public address. He urged the demonstrators to observe the mutual agreement reached with the city authorities, while paying tributes to the victims of Stalinist reprisals with due respect and order. Yet the mayor's address did not bring about any essential changes in the speakers' attitudes. Nevertheless, the demonstration went on without any further disturbances. [passage omitted]

A large part of the public spoke favorably of the new policy of glasnost and democracy now underway in this country. Others expressed their dissatisfaction, pointing out that perestroyka was not being introduced as deep and fast enough as they would like it.

But one of the 17 speakers was stopped from making his speech:

[Begin (Pancerka) recording in Lithuanian fading into English translation] We demand that the authorities should adhere to pluralism and likewise we too should follow this line. My opinion slightly differs from that expressed by the speakers so far. We all have one common goal. To my mind we are almost together with Mikhail Gorbachev. We must be wise. I was a guerilla myself. I am not going to be told by any snifflers what I must or must not do. [sounds of shouting and whistling] [end recording]

This particular man was not allowed to express his opinion. But our correspondent found his attempt quite interesting, and so he approached him after the meeting:

[Begin (Pancerka) recording in Lithuanian fading into English translation] My name is (Pancerka). I was once a guerilla. I spent 20 years in a labor camp. This is a spontaneous meeting, it attracts all kinds of people. No wonder the opinions expressed may be biased. But I think that in a democratic country it should be so. It is normal. These are our lessons of democracy. Democracy requires courage. I said what I thought. [end recording] [passage omitted]

The demonstration was closed up by one of Lithuania's most active Lithuanian dissidents, Antanas Terleckas. He thanked to those assembled for their courage in taking part and expressed his gratitude to the city authorities for the permission to arrange the demonstration.

In conclusion Antanas Terleckas invited the assembled to take part in the next demonstration due to be held in the same place at the end of summer.

In his telephone interview to the Voice of America, Antanas Terleckas increased the number of participants to as many as 5-6,000. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Writers Union Elects New Leaders

PM2106082988 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Jun 88 p 5

[Own correspondent P. Keydoshyus report under the rubric "LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Reports": "Writers Elect"]

[Text] Vilnius—People's Poet Alfonsas Maldonis verbally announced his intention to resign as chairman of the Lithuanian Writers Union Board a year ago, and followed this announcement up in writing. Attempts were made to persuade him to stay on, in the hope that the chairman would "change his mind." But A. Maldonis did not "change his mind" and announced in April that he would take an unpaid leave of absence until such time as his request was granted. The reason was this: A. Maldonis had spent 18 years in the leadership of the Lithuanian Writers Union and, in his opinion, this had been more than long enough. Fresh, young forces must be recruited for this work. Furthermore, in A. Maldonis' words, he had not found the last few years creatively triumphant, and his passion for poetry remained as ardent as ever.

A plenum of the Lithuanian Writers Union Board held a few days ago granted A. Maldonis' request and relieved him of his duties as chairman of the board, expressing thanks for his many years of honest work.

The plenum also decided that there ought to be no limit on the number of candidates but, in order to be elected, a candidate would have to win one-half plus one of all votes cast by all present members of the board. If none of the candidates won the required number of votes in the first round, there would be a second round to elect one of the two candidates who had won the greatest number of votes. The elections were to take place by secret ballot. Six candidates were nominated.

But Yustinas Martsinkyavichyus immediately refused to run for election, his reason being that he wished to totally devote himself to creative work. V. Bubnis and M. Martinaytis withdrew as candidates for the same reason. Thus, only three candidates remained: critic P. Brazhenas, prose writer V. Martinkus, and poet S. Gyada. Two of them were current members of the Lithuanian Writers Union leadership—P. Brazhenas as first secretary, and V. Martinkus as secretary of the board. There was no need to have a second round. Twenty-three of the 36 board members attending the plenum gave their votes to V. Martinkus, who thus became the eighth chairman of the Lithuanian Writers Union Board.

V. Martinkus is the author of famous novels and novellas like "Hunt in the Reserve," "Drops," "Rocks," "Pennant for a Family Celebration," and others. He is 45 years of age and a candidate of philosophical sciences. For 10 years he headed the Kaunas Branch of the Lithuanian Writers Union and has been a secretary of the Lithuanian Writers Union Board since 1985.

Poet S. Gyada was elected secretary of the board by a majority, gaining a victory over prose writer R. Gudaytis.

A. Chesnavichus, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers, and Yu. Paletskis, chief of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Culture Department, also took part in the plenum's work.

Ligachev Visits Moscow Construction Collective

LD1506223788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Jun 88

[Text] Comrade Ligachev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 June met with the collective of the multiskilled team of Building Directorate No 6 of the Moscow Construction Design and Building Association Moscow Construction Trust No 1. The collective is headed by Zatvornitskiy, a Hero of Socialist Labor and a delegate to the 19th all-union party conference. Ligachev familiarized himself with the progress of housing construction in a Vidnoye microrayon in Moscow Oblast. He also familiarized himself with the labor organization and the builders' production and living conditions. They held a frank and thorough conversation on improving the organization of capital construction and on the need to substantially enhance the quality of work and the output of construction materials industry enterprises in the town.

Comrade Ligachev talked about the CPSU Central Committee's work on directing restructuring as well as their preparation for the 19th all-union party conference. He also discussed the Central Committee's measures to strengthen the country's economy and to solve social tasks, and he talked about the party's foreign policy activity. The workers expressed their support for the CPSU Central Committee's line on implementing restructuring. Comrade Ligachev also visited shops and chatted with the townsfolk.

Zaykov at Moscow Urban Development Council

PM2106101188 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 88 p 1

[MOSTASS report: "Public Decides"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] At a routine session on 21 May, the public council for the urban development of Moscow examined progress in the preparation of the draft General Plan for the development of the capital and the Moscow region for the period through 2010. [passage omitted]

The session was addressed by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom. [passage omitted]

Solovyev Attends Leningrad Delegates' Meeting

LD1806020688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today in Leningrad there was a meeting of delegates to the 19th all-union party conference from the Leningrad CPSU organization.

[S. Dukhavin, identified by screen caption] The meeting was an unusual one. It was not supposed to draw up some policy document, and there was no discussion of who should speak at the forthcoming conference. The delegates assembled at Smolnyy so as to share their thoughts about the progress of perestoyka and to exchange views on the CPSU Theses and suggestions arising from them. The meeting, which was attended by Comrade Solovyev, candidate menber of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast party committee, was preceded by broad discussion of the theses at open party gatherings in labor collectives. Delegates to the conference had also been to them.

The meeting was addressed by workers and cultural figures, party officials, and the heads of enterprises, and the range of issues and topics touched on in these speeches was wide. How, for example, can the law on the socialist enterprise be made to operate with full force? What has to be done to democratize party and public life? When calling for the extension of various rights, are we not forgetting abut the need to uphold in practice the irreproachable discharging by everyone of his obligations? But, of course, all those who spoke emphasized their devotion to the cause of perestroyka and expressed their ardent interest in seeing that it confidently advanced further in all directions.

[Begin recording of remarks by A.I. Aleksandrov, first secretary of Leningrad's Moskovskiy Raykom, identified by screen caption] I shall probably go to the conference with a feeling of some dissatisfaction, dissatisfaction with the fact that, during the 2 and 1/2 years that have passed since the 27th party congress, I, as the secretary of a raykom and, probably, many Communists could have done much more, even in the conditions in which we found ourselves. I think that that feeling of dissatisfaction, together with the documents that we shall be drawing up, will be that selfsame main lever that will advance perestroyka further. [end recording]

Shcherbitiskiy Attends Ukrainian CP Session

LD0406102288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Jun 88

[Text] The progress in restructuring the work of the Ukraine's local soviet and economic bodies to further improve consumer services to the population, and to accelerate development and improvement in the consumer services sector is at the center of attention of the eighth session of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, which has opened in Kiev. It was noted in the report and speeches that the republic has overfulfilled its tasks to commission housing and schools, children's preschool establishments, and hospitals, that the consmption of foodstuffs has increased somewhat, and that a comprehensive program for the development and production of consumer goods and of the services sector is being implemented.

However, the state of affairs in the republic's social sphere remains difficult. The significant losses of working time in the national economy are connected with inadequacies in the development of consumer services at industrial enterprises—these have been organized at only one-third of enterprises. The work of enterprises involved in passenger transport and communications, of health and cultural establishments, and of sports facilities comes in for much criticism.

Comrade Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, is taking part in the work of the session.

Murakhovskiy Chairs Environmental Meeting

LD2006222488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Text] A routine session of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium commission on environmental conservation and the efficient use of natural resources took place today. Progress in implementing in the current 5-year plan a target program for the rational and comprehensive use of mineral and raw material resources in the national economy was considered. It was noted that there was as yet no radical improvement in the utilization of resources in the operations of mining industry branches. Losses of mineral raw materials, caused by inefficient and uncomprehensive extraction and processing, remain unacceptably high. This does serious damage to the environment and the country's economy.

The session laid down specific measures, including economic ones, to eliminate the lag in the program's implementation.

Steps to improve the artificial propagation of fish stocks were also examined. It was stressed that despite individual achievements, the scale and efficiency of work in this sphere as a whole did not meet the tasks that had been set. The session specified additional measures to develop further, improve qualitatively, and increase efficiency in artifically rearing fish. The session was chaired by Comrade Murakhovskiy.

Secretary Biryukova Tours Ivanovo Oblast

PM2006122188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Visit to Ivanovo Oblast"]

[Text] A.P. Biryukova, CPSU Central Committee secretary, visited Ivanovo Oblast from 9-11 June. She toured enterprises working in the textile and light industries and in trade and consumer services.

During meetings and conversations at the collectives of the Ivanovo Textiles and Sewn Goods Production Association, the "Privolzhskaya Kommuna" Cotton Combine in Navoloki, the V.P. Nogin Spinning and Weaving Factory in Vichuga, and the Kokhma Cotton Combine, much attention was paid to questions of making the most efficient use of the opportunities offered by the new economic mechanism and the Law on the State Enterprise to increase the production, expand the range, and improve the quality of consumer goods.

A.P. Biryukova noted the need for all workers to have a thorough knowledge of economic management methods, for economic accountability to be introduced within the factory, and for consumer demand to be carefully and promptly studied. Support was expressed for the experience of labor collectives which are actively using the own-resources method of construction to resolve urgent social problems, first and foremost housing.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary familiarized herself in detail with the course of primary organizations' discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the activity of labor collective councils, and the practice of electing leaders. It was emphasized that the masses' active involvement in the management of the affairs of society and the state and in concrete practical work is the vital condition for the success of restructuring.

A.P. Biryukova met with participants in the all-union rally of light industry production pacemakers which is being held in Ivanovo and addressed the rally.

She was accompanied on her tour of the oblast by M.A. Knyazyuk, first secretary of Ivanovo CPSU Obkom, and V.N. Tikhomirov, chairman of the oblispolkom.

Report on Kirghiz 21 May Party Plenum

PM2106102188 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 22 May 88 p 1

[KIRTAG "Information Report on Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] A Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee plenum was held on 21 May 1988.

The plenum discussed the question "On the republic party organization's tasks in implementing the reform of secondary and higher education and in providing ideological support for restructuring in the light of the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum decisions." The report on this question was delivered by M.Sh. Sherimkulov, secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee.

Taking part in the debate on the report were: S.A. Medvedev, director of the Kirghiz mining and metallurgical combine; U.K. Chinaliyev, first secretary of Frunze party gorkom; Z.V. Cherkashchenko, chairman of the "Pobeda" kolkhoz in Tyupskiy Rayon; Zh. Saadanbekov, chief of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Department; S. Toktomambetova, director of the Toktogul secondary school in Tash-Kumyr; V.I. Orlov, first secretary of Przhevalsk party gorkom; R.S. Kulmatov, first secretary of Osh party obkom; M.I. Paryshkura, general director of the "Stankostroitelnyy zavod imeni V.I. Lenina" production association; R.I. Otunbayev, deputy chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Council of Ministers; K. Aknazarov, first secretary of Kochkorskiy party raykom; V.V. Lyubimova, milkmaid at the "Kelechek" sovkhoz in Panfilovskiy Rayon; M. Bazarkulov, Kirghiz SSR minister of education; V.I. Artemov, second secretary of Talas party obkom; O. Toktomushova, leader of a crop farming team at the "Kommunistchil" Sovkhoz in Ak-Talinskiy Rayon; V.M. Zhuravlev, rector of Frunze polytechnical institute; A. Akayev, vice president of the Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences; E. Abakirov, chairman of the Kirghiz Trade Union Council; V.N. Klimina, sewing machine operator at the Dzhalal-Abad sewn goods factory; A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee; A.P. Khrestenkov, first secretary of Issyk-Kul party obkom; and K. Mukanbetov, first secretary of Kok-Yangak party gorkom.

The plenum adopted a resolution on the question under discussion.

G.N. Kiselev, second secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report "On progress in acting on criticisms and proposals made by delegates to the 18th Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums."

V.N. Tyurebayev, Kirghiz SSR minister of communications, put forward some proposals on this question.

The plenum adopted a resolution on the question.

The plenum elected delegates to the 19th all-union party conference.

The nomination of prospective delegates had taken place initially in primary party organizations, cities, and rayons. The Central Committee Bureau examined communists' nominations and submitted them for the plenum's discussion. The plenum elected 40 delegates from the republic party organization by secret ballot.

An organizational question was examined. The plenum relieved A.K. Sultanov of his duties as chief of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Transport and Communications Department for lack of political maturity and for unscrupulousness in his work.

Taking part in the plenum's work were V.I. Bessarabov, sector chief in the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Department; V.A. Durasov, USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy; A.A. Yezhevskiy, USSR minister of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building; S.A. Losev, general director of TASS; and V.N. Ivanov and V.F. Matyushkin, executives of the CPSU Central Committee.

At this point the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee ended.

Tajik, Uzbek Party Secretaries Meet

LD1906151788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 19 Jun 88

[Text] First Secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Makhamov and First Secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Nishanov today concluded their meeting in Dushanbe. Also taking part in the meeting were Pallayev, chairman of the Tajik Supreme Soviet Presidium; Khabibullayev, chairman of the Uzbek Supreme Soviet Presidium; Khayeyev, chairman of the Tajik Council of Ministers; and Kadyrov, chairman of the Uzbek Council of Ministers.

They discussed ways to further develop and strengthen cooperation, economic and cultural relations, and international education between the two neighboring union republics. The guests from Uzbekistan visited the Nurek GES and the Rogun GES, which is under construction. They also visited the Tajik Aluminum works, other projects of the territorial production complex of southern Tajikistan, construction sites, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes. They exchanged experience in party and ideological work in the conditions of expanding glasnost and democracy.

Kharchev on Church's Status, Ties With Vatican

PM2106114288 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 16 Jun 88 p 10

[Interview with Konstantin Kharchev, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Council of Religious Affairs, by Alceste Santini; date and place not given—first paragraph is L'UNITA introduction]

[Text] Moscow—Near to the end of the official celebrations of the millenium of Christianity in Russia, which were again given broad coverage in the Soviet press yesterday, we asked chairman of the Council of Ministers Council of Religious Affairs, Konstantin Kharchev, to give his opinion of the outlook for dialogue between Church and state. "I believe we are witnessing what could be termed revolutionary changes in relations between state and Church, between believers and nonbelievers. For the first time CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev has indicated a specific policy line so that the churches and believers too can take part in building socialism. This is a considerable change from the past, when the Church and believers felt excluded precisely because their potential role was not considered or acknowledged."

[Santini] Does this mean that from now on the state and party will regard believers and nonbelievers equally, without any more discrimination?

[Kharchev] We not only assert, but also want to demonstrate in practice, that socialist society is the homeland both of believers and nonbelievers and that they share a common future in developing socialist democracy in our country. We want to create jointly a society characterized by the values of humanism and a plurality of opinions and in which the Church enjoys better conditions than in capitalist societies.

[Santini] Does this mean that restructuring now entails the recognition of a positive aspect to religion?

[Kharchev] This is precisely the change that I define as revolutionary and that began in 1985, with the start of the restructuring process, which has undergone significant developments. Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with Patriarch Pimen is an unprecedented event. It was on that occasion that Gorbachev talked about the shared future of believers and nonbelievers.

[Santini] Will the new law on freedom of conscience reflect these new attitudes? When will it be published?

[Kharchev] The new law, based on the Leninist principles of the separation of state and Church, will grant the Church more leeway, more freedom.

[Santini] Gorbachev's meeting with Cardinal Casaroli received broad coverage in the world press precisely because it was unprecedented. What can you say about future periodic and regular relations between the Soviet Government and the Vatican?

[Kharchev] I too would describe the meeting as exceptional. As for the establishment of contacts, this is something new and they will serve to resolve the remaining problems.

[Santini] What are the main problems that you raised in your meeting with Cardinal Casaroli?

[Kharchev] We talked for 2 hours in a cordial and friendly atmosphere. First, the Vatican does not recognize the borders of the Baltic republics, that is, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Second, Vatican Radio still broadcasts cold war-type programs against the USSR. During his visit to Latin America the pope used some unpleasant expressions. This attitude creates problems for dialogue.

[Santini] How did Cardinal Casaroli reply?

[Kharchev] My opinion is that Cardinal Casaroli wants to resolve these problems by seeking a solution to really set the dialogue on new foundations, in the spirit of open-mindedness that existed in Moscow.

Filaret Addresses Kiev Millenium Observance

AU2106114288 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 15 Jun 88 p 3

[RATAU report: "On the Occasion of the Jubilee"]

[Text] To commemorate the millenium of the adoption of Christianity in Rus, a solemn act was held in the T.G. Shevchenko State Academic Opera and Ballet House on 14 June. It was opened by Filaret, patriarchal Exarch of the Ukraine, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galich.

In welcoming the hierarchs and other clergymen of the Orthodox Church of Rus, representatives of the USSR and Ukrainian SSR authorities, the public, and guests of honor who arrived from the other republics and from abroad, Metropolitan Filaret emphasized that the ceremonies in Kiev were an integral part of the celebrations inaugurated in Moscow on 5 June to commemorate the millenium of the baptism of Rus. During these celebrations, the speaker said, concern about peace problems was expressed along with the hope that, by the year 2000, it will be possible to attain a nuclear-free world. We attach much importance to the high appraisal given by the state to the peace-making activity of the Orthodox Church of Rus. We inhabitants of Kiev, Metropolitan Filaret said, are particularly pleased to commemorate this jubilee in Kiev because Christianity had spread all over our country precisely from here, from these Kiev hills.

In his report dedicated to the millenium of the baptism of Rus, the Exarch of the Ukraine pointed out: The adoption of Christianity by Kiev Rus had influenced all spheres of the country's life, filled the fatherland's history with a positive content, and helped the state of Rus to take hold of a worthy place in the development of world culture and civilization. When we speak about the people of Rus, he emphasized, we have in mind not only the Russians by nationality, but also the Ukrainians and the Belorussians who stem from the same root of Kiev Rus.

In the millenial history, the Orthodox Church has been with the people, the speaker continued. During the Great Patriotic War, when the church helped the people spiritually and materially, this manifested itself with particular clarity. And the church continues to serve the people's well-being at present.

Having recalled the circumstances of the proclamation of the so-called "Brest Union," Metropolitan Filaret pointed out that this act was presented as the union of churches, but in reality proved to be a new schism. The union was prepared in secrecy from the laity, and it was adopted without the consent of their council [sobornoye soglasiye]. It was an act of the bishops. Instead of church unity, the union brought hostility and hatred among the people of the same blood. The struggle against the union was first of all a manifestation of the laity's self-identification with the idea of the council [sobornoye samosoznaniye tserkovnogo naroda].

The celebration of the millenium of the introduction of Christianity in Rus is taking place under the conditions of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost, the metropolitan said. We can see and feel that the positive process taking place in the country also applies to the Church. Evidence of this are the newly opened parishes, the newly built churches, the monasteries handed over to the Church, the increased circulation of the Bible, and many other facts. The creed of many millions, he said, particularly rejoiced at the handing over of a part of the Kiev Pechersk abbey to the Orthodox Church. The Exarch of the Ukraine called M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with Patriarch Pimen at the Kremlin a historic one, and expressed sincere gratitude to the Soviet leadership and the government of the Ukraine for their benevolent consideration for the needs of the church.

Messages of greetings to those present at the act were addressed by representatives of various religious confessions and public organizations.

Present at the solemn act were Yu.G. Bakhtin, Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium deputy chairman; M.A. Orlik, Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman; V.A. Zgurskiy, Kiev Gorispolkom chairman; K.M. Kharchev, chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers; N.A. Kolesnik, chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs under the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers; and leaders of consulates general of the socialist countries in Kiev.

On the same day the participants in Kiev festivities commemorating the millenium of the introduction of Christianity in Rus laid a wreath at the Grave of the Unknown Soldier in the Park of Eternal Glory.

On the occasion of the jubilee, all-night vigils were observed in St. Vladimir's Cathedral, in monasteries, and other churches of Kiev.

Latvia Celebrates Church Millenium

LD1906205988 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 19 Jun 88

[Text] Riga June 19 TASS—The believers of various nationalities today marked the millenium of the adoption of Orthodoxy in Russia in 87 Orthodox churches of Latvia with a celebration thanks-giving moleben [as received] in Slavic and Lettish languages.

Metropolitan Leonid of Riga and Latvia, 75, held an evening service in concelebration of all Riga city clergy at the St Trinity Cathedral. It was attended by representatives of fraternal Christian confessions, state power bodies, the general public, and guests from abroad. Metropolitan Leonid read out the "Statement on the Proceedings of the Local Council" and "Directions of the Russian Orthodox Church for the Coming Centuries."

During World War Two, Metropolitan Leonid had been a military physician and participated in the liberation of Riga from Nazi invaders. On the eve of the Church jubilee he was awarded the top distinction of Latvia for his lofty activities in defence of peace. In the celebration service he again urged the believers to pray for peace.

Orthodoxy had penetrated Latvia from Bulgaria prior to the baptism of Russia. But Orthodox Church had got a governing bishop in Riga only in the 19th century. Orthodox Church in Latvia lived through hard times during the years of the bourgeois rule (1920-1940) when it was on the verge of being banned.

RSFSR Health Minister Interviewed

LD1906211188 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1317 GMT on 19 June carries a 15-minute program, entitled "Today Is Medical Workers' Day." In the program, an unidentified correspondent interviews RSFSR Health Minister Anatoliy Ivanovich Potapov.

Potapov says that in the 70 years since the setting up of the People's Commissariat for Health, a genuinely national health service has been built in the USSR. Challenged by the journalist on "unresolved matters and negative phenomena" in the health service, Potapov says: "You know what the problem is? We, above all, are to blame. We beat the drums when we should have been sounding the alarm. What are the errors today? Above all, they concern the material and technical base. Today 4 percent of the national budget goes toward the health service. This is clearly too little. In the major countries today the figure is 10 or 11 percent."

Potapov says the "extensive model" of the Soviet health service "has not been geared to final results." He said the system of training for doctors was "compromised." "You know, in the last 10 years the bureaucratism in medicine has crushed us." Potapov adds: "We must change the structure of the health service; we must alter the mechanisms of health service management, and other things, on which the USSR Ministry of Health and the RSFSR Ministry of Health are working." The "inertia" in thinking about doctors and health service workers had to be changed. In the RSFSR this year, 10 diagnostic centers are to be opened.

As a member of the government commission to eliminate the consequences of the train blast in Arzamas, Potapov says that exactly 10 minutes after the explosion around 10 medical teams and a first aid unit were on the spot. "I must say with all authority that since the accident two of the injured have died. In the explosion we did indeed lose a number of people who had been injured. We have had to bury 84 people. A total of 744 people applied to us for treatment as outpatients." Within an hour, there were 64 medical teams from Arzamas and its environs. Within 2 hours, teams arrived from Gorkiy, and within 3 hours 19 teams had arrived from Moscow."

Anti-AIDS Campaign Described

LD1806152288 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 18 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—There is still only one man with AIDS in the USSR—the 36-year-old interpretor who catched the disease during a long trip abroad as a result of homosexual intercourse, the newspaper TRUD writes today. He is being treated with a number of drugs which improved his condition.

Screening the blood of people from the so-called risk group—prostitutes, homosexuals and drug abusers—helped reveal 56 carriers of the AIDS virus (the virus is in the body, but has not caused the clinical stage of the disease).

A lot is being done in the country today to test donors, and the banks of blood and its preparations, to examine the risk group. As many as 380 diagnosing laboratories, whose number will exceed 1,000 by the end of the year, are fitted with equipment.

Customs Official on Fighting Drug Traffic

LD1706170088 Moscow TASS in English 1433 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—During the past two years Soviet customs officers have detained six freight containers with eleven tons of hashish whereas the annual catch from "mules", as couriers are known in the jargon of smugglers, averages 20-30 kilos of drugs. A TASS correspondent learned this from Yuriy Fedoskin, deputy head of the department at the State Customs Administration charged with the task of combatting contraband and violations of customs regulations.

"For the Soviet customs authorities attempts to carry drugs in transit through the Soviet Union are not new", he went on. "For a long time the USSR was not thought to be a country from which drugs were likely to emanate and smugglers decided to capitalise on this. You see, when a flight comes, say, from Latin America or South-east Asia customs officials are very vigilant but when it is from the USSR checks are less rigorous. And 'mules' started carrying drugs in transit via the USSR to Western Europe, by taking Aeroflot flights."

Fedoskin said that the first container with drugs was seized in the USSR in 1986. It was on its way to West Germany. Last year Soviet customs officiers together with colleagues from Holland, Canada and Britain carried out operations that resulted in the seizure of large consignments of drugs and court proceedings against the "businessmen" in their respective countries. "By the way," Yuriy Fedoskin went on, "late last year and early this year we arrested here three Argentines and two Peruvians who were in transit and had drugs in their possession."

"We are prepared for cooperation with the customs authorities of other countries", Yuriy Fedoskin said. "There is a need of contacts and a regular exchange of information. On our part we will provide all the assistance we can."

Militia Spokesman Warns Against Disturbances

LD2206114788 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jun (TASS)—TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov reports:

Today's briefing in the Main Directorate of the Moscow Militia was devoted to questions of ensuring and preserving law and order in the Soviet capital during the 19th all-union party conference, which opens 28 June.

It was announced that the internal affairs organs are aware of meetings and demonstrations being planned in Moscow with the participation of various "informal" groupings, so-called "refuseniks", Crimean Tatars, and so on. The Main Directorate's spokesman recalled the order adopted by the Moscow City Soviet for the holding of meetings and demonstrations in the capital. It provides for the city authorities being notified in advance of activities being planned, their idea, aims, and location. If a meeting or demonstration is permitted, it will take place without interference from the militia. But if permission is not forthcoming, then the militia is duty-bound to end it in full accordance with the norms of the law.

This is what happened last Saturday in Moscow's Pushkin Square, for example. The passions of the representatives of "informal" groupings reached such a level that the militia was obliged to warn those there, through megaphones, of the inadmissibility of such behavior. Curses, insults, and threats aimed at the militia and at Soviet and party organs were heard in response. As a result, particularly "zealous" demonstrators were arrested. They will be subjected to administrative punishment and the degree of guilt and extent of punishment will be determined by the courts.

Noting that the special arrangement for the work of the militia introduced on the eve of the Moscow summit will be maintained in the city during the conference, the spokesman of the Moscow Militia Main Directorate said: "We will react sharply in cases where 'unplanned' meetings and demonstrations are of an openly provocative nature, as was the case on Saturday. Democracy does not mean license or anarchy. We shall not allow law and order in the city, or the peace of its inhabitants, to be violated."

TV Coverage Plans for Conference Outlined

PM1806132588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 7

[Interview with G. Shevelev, chief editor of Central Television's Main Information Editorial Office, by Ye. Shafran: "Reporting on a Major Event"; date and place not given]

[Text] Next week staffers from Central Television information services complete their preparations for work on the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. G. Shevelev, chief editor of the Central Television's Main Information Editorial Office, talks about it:

"We will set up our television cameras in the halls of the Palace of Congresses and on Kremlin territory—where all the most important events will be happening. Up-to-the-minute reports, interviews, and bulletins will be continuously broadcast for the duration of the conference. We are planning to carry short information broadcasts every day at 1100 and 1600, with fuller reports in the evening at 1800 on what has happened and diaries of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

"There will be two complete live broadcasts on the opening and closing day of the conference. But, you understand, it is impossible to foresee everything for such an event. So, clearly, things may have to be changed as we go along, and extra, unplanned broadcasts may be transmitted. Apart from this, all news programs—'Vremya,' '120 Minutes,' and the traditional 'Novosti'—will prepare their own special items. There will be speeches by delegates, talks with them, and discussions. Our own local correspondents will acquaint viewers with the opinion of inhabitants of their regions on the events taking place in Moscow.

"Our main task is to report as fully as possible on the conference and convey its spirit and atmosphere. Central Television's best reporters and correspondents, leading commentators, and political observers have been enlisted in this work."

Yuriy Afanasyev Conference Nomination Viewed

PM1706145388 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 22, 29 May 88 p 9

[Natalya Izyumova report: "Time To Rethink Nomination Procedures"]

[Text] Prof. Yuriy Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow Institute for Historian-Archivists, was nominated by his fellow Communists to the 19th all-union party conference, with 267 in favour and one against. This was on April 20. On May 20, none of the members of the bureau of the Sverdlovskiy District Party Committee voted for this candidate.

Yuriy Afanasyev was made rector just eighteen months ago. His reputation as an able rector and lecturer and contributor to the press have made him one of the front-ranking men of the perestroyka process. It was only natural to nominate him to the 19th party conference.

Secretary of the Party Committee of the Institute Valeriy Minayev:

"On May 11, secretary of primary party organizations of the district were told that Communists in the Sverdlovskiy District were supposed to nominate seven candidates. The Party organizations in the district were divided into seven groups. More than 30 institutions of learning formed the public education group, and the Institute of Historian-Archivists was part of it. However, on the suggestion of the District Party Committee, the secretaries decided that the biggest and the most reputed Party organization be given the right to nominate their candidate. They voted for Moscow's Mendeleyev Institute of Chemical Technology."

Says Communist Boris Ilizarov, head of a department of the Institute of Historian-Archivists:

"No one is going to challenge the authority of the Institute of Chemical Technology but we are supposed to be delegating to the Conference not whole teams but individual Communists. And active supporters of perestroyka can be found not just in authoritative and large Party organizations. I believe the best system is direct elections, where general meetings of Communists from a group, say, the public education group, consider candidates nominated by all organizations involved."

The Institute of Chemical Technology nominated Vitalina Trifonenko, a fourth-year student.

Communist Pavel Sergeyev, a fifth-year student of the Institute of Historian-Archivists: "We have nothing against the Institute of Chemical Technology nominee, but everything becomes clear with comparison; the main criterion is one's actual contribution to perestroyka. Trifonenko, who only joined the Party in March, 1988, and Afanasyev can't be put on the same level."

Vitalina Trifonenko: "We can't be compared. Both young people like me and people like Afanasyev should be represented at the Conference."

The Plenary Meeting of the District Party Committee did not take place. According to second Secretary of the District Party Committee Aleksandr Bortsov, it was cancelled because of organizational difficulties. The district nominees were discussed at the bureau session. One of the nominees was Afanasyev. His inclusion on the list had been insisted upon by Communists, Komsomols, non-Party people, ordinary students and teachers at the Institute of Historian-Archivists. They had told the Plenary Meeting of the Sverdlovskiy District Party Committee that Yuriy Afanasyev should be given a chance to be a nominee for the 19th Party Conference. Communists and non-Communists of 11 other organizations in Moscow voted for this proposal.

Then I attended the bureau session at the District Party Committee.

The candidates answered questions from members of the bureau for four hours. Afanasyev was asked more questions than any other candidate. "What was your stand as a historian during the stagnation period? Will you be contributing to perestroyka if you don't go through to the Party Conference? Don't you think you give too much of your time to journalism?"

I've already mentioned that Afanasyev was voted down at the bureau session. I would like only to add that letters of support for Afanasyev are pouring into different organizations. The ill-conceived electoral procedure hurts the interests of both nominees and those who nominate them.

'Top Priority' Program on Party Conference

LD1806140688 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 17 Jun 88

["Top Priority" program, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov, with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov—not further identified]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to "Top Priority". I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Together with me in our studio are Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov.

As we approach the 19th national Communist Party conference, the first since 1941, I think that the prevailing mood here is that the conference will give a mighty boost to the new Soviet policy known as glasnost and perestroyka.

[Unidentified speaker] G and P, as they say.

[Kuznetsov] G and P. All right. Now last month, our newspapers published a draft document for the party conference in the form of Theses. They've been endorsed by the Central Committee and are now being widely discussed in the press. What are in your view some of the key points of that, of that document? Dr Bogdanov please.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, that today's "Top Priority" excites me very much, let me state it first, excites me much more than any foreign policy "Top Priority" we have been discussing. You have mentioned Theses. I would like my American listeners over there to know that I'm carrying that book, small book, with the Theses of the conference in my pocket every day, and I'm looking at it as something really not only exciting (?there) but giving me a lot of food for reflection, for digestion, and so on.

[Kuznetsov] Okay, you, you sound like you've become religious in a way, you know. It's like the Bible for you.

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes if you like, it's such. Yes, yes, if you like, it's a Bible for me.

[Plekhanov] But it's a Bible in which you can make corrections.

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes, that's what I'm going to say because you have mentioned that there is the very huge discussion all over the Soviet Union, all over the Party organization, because this Bible, as Sergey put it very rightly, it's not a Bible to just to....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yeah, but just to correct it. This is an invitation for dissent, if you like. Let me express some major ideas.

First of all, it goes about the reform or changes of the whole political system on the base of democratization and glasnost. Number two, it goes about the creation of the state of law, the legal state. State based on law.

[Plekhanov] Government by laws not by men, in other words.

[Bogdanov] Yeah. Number three, it goes about the party itself. We are one-party system, so they can imagine how it is important what this party is, what is it. So, how party's democratized within will impact very, very much on the whole society.

[Kuznetsov] What of the proposals to democratize the....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] That, now, now I come down to the proposals. Secret, number one, secret ballots, secret ballots. Number two, no more than two terms in the office even for....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] For party officials

[Plekhanov] And for government officials.

[Bogdanov] For party, and for the government officials, no more than two terms even for the highest office, even for the highest office. Then, free exchange of views, free discussions....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Within the party.

[Bogdanov] Within the party, within the party, within the party.

[Kuznetsov] In other words, the documents provide for turning the party into a pluralistic political organization with all kinds of views, disagreements.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, how it can be differently if you talk about the socialistic pluralism?

[Kuznetsov] Yes, in a one-party system that's the only way out.

[Bogdanov] Yes, that's the only way out, and if socialistic pluralism is accepted as a political idea of the society, party has to reflect that.

[Kuznetsov] The Theses call for a shift of power from the party to elected councils or soviets, for more democratic elections inside and outside the party. We've already mentioned that. If the Communist Party releases, gives up, some of its functions, what is the party needed for? This is one of the most crucial questions that's being asked these days.

[Plekhanov] The party is needed to provide leadership. That's what parties are for.

[Bogdanov] Political leadership.

[Plekhanov] Political leadership, yes, not day-to-day management of society, because there's too much of that, because the party is now too much involved in the running of the economy, society and so on. So, but it should confine itself to providing political leadership.

[Kuznetsov] What is it? What do you mean by....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Well, providing political leadership, that means providing ideas, advancing those ideas and giving direction to the course of public events through the members of the party. There are 20 million people in the party, 99 percent, yes, 99 percent of them are not functionaries, they are just citizens who happen to be party members and have a special duty, a political duty to carry out the policy of the party. So, there is a lot of the political things that the party members can do. In fact, when the party is too much involved in the administrative apparatus, then for the majority of the party members, for that huge mass of party members, there is nothing really to do because they are not part of the apparatus, so what are they to do except support what the party is doing. However, if the emphasis in the party work is on the political leadership, that activities, that huge body, [is] the real strength of the party. So I think that the party will become stronger as a result of being taken away from the administration.

[Bogdanov] And maybe in a way more influential.

[Plekhanov] More influential. But of course it will have to win hearts and minds. It will have to....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Do you expect the party to shrink in size from say 19 million down to say....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I do, I do, I do.

[Plekhanov] That is quite possible.

[Bogdanov] I do, I do. Look, if you will, you talk of the party in political terms, you have to purify it. You have to purify it.

[Kuznetsov] Purge, you mean?

[Bogdanov] Purge, well, I don't like this word.

[Kuznetsov] Oh, but that's a [word indistinct]. Okay, purify.

[Bogdanov] Purify it, purge, you know, you have just to, people have to make a choice, if you like. If you have no power as such, I mean in the office, party office, but if you have to build your own image by your political influence, it makes a lot of difference. You have to believe in that, you know.

[Plekhanov] But people will have, if they want to leave the party they must be assured, they must have guarantees they can do it without any fear of persecution. That's also part of the discussions of the debates now.

[Kuznetsov] Well, what do you mean persecution? If you leave the party now you're in....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Like, administrative, administrative action at the place where he or she works. It's not an easy move to put a party membership card on the table and say, well, I quit.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, I'm sorry, we have a number of cases, I don't know exact figures, but we have a number of cases all over the Soviet Union after the revelations of the cult of personality, ominous revelations, some, I don't know exactly, just....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] ...left the Party.

[Bogdanov, continuing] ...left the Party, and nothing happened to them.

[Kuznetsov] Well, let's take a look at some of the other opinions voiced by our people, by those who write to newspapers. Well, some of them are: let's abolish the system of internal passports, let's publish the party's budget, let's create new organizations or allow those that already exist to compete with the Soviet Communist Party for power, let's print transcripts of meetings of the Politburo, and my observation is that nobody's any longer surprised here at these proposals. We're kind of used to them. The only people that are surprised are, in my view, foreign, especially American journalists accredited in Moscow, and they seem to be unable to swallow that much amount of free and uncensored debate in our country. Would you agree, Sergey? I see that you're smiling.

[Plekhanov] I think the editors back home in the United States are less comfortable than most of the journalists here, because for a lot of journalists who I've talked with, it's a very exciting time to be in Moscow. Moscow seems to be now a much preferred place for a lot of you, you know, newsmen, especially young newsmen and newswomen to work in. But they have a problem with their editors because the editors who have not been here for a long time, or some who have been here but, you know, a long time ago, it is still very much the old Soviet Union, the society that existed in the past, and when they get the reports back from Moscow by those newspersons, you know, writing about glasnost, perestroyka, and say, well, (?look), you've been taken in by Soviet propaganda, we can't believe that this is what's happening. But I hope that after the summit, when there's been an unprecedented amount of exposure of American viewers and American readers to what's happening, really happening in the Soviet Union, I think those reporters on the site in Moscow will have an easier time because Americans, I think, now understand and President Reagan has confirmed that having been here, that yes, the situation is changing. It is a new society being born.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I think there were even some quarrels within the American journalistic corps in Moscow and the corps, the people, were split into kind of two uneven camps, and the long-timers, that is, people who have been here for some time and have witnessed the new changes, and those who came to cover the summit, and these kind of accusations were flying around that one side was claiming that, yeah, like you said, you were taken in by the Soviets, you are being used, you are becoming pinko, pro-communist. Do you think that this debate, that this current debate, has been urged by the top echelons of the party? Do you believe that this is true, or perhaps it's a very genuine outpour of popular feelings and sentiments?

[Bogdanov] I believe that of course. Maybe, maybe the first push, or whatever it is, was made from the top, but there is one very important point which I would like to make. That push, or that seed, was planted in a very rich soil, in already very rich soil.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, society was waiting for it.

[Bogdanov] Yeah, you understand what I mean. Society, the society, as Sergey says, the society was not only ready, was over-ripe, over-ripe.

[Kuznetsov] The prevailing mood here is that of expectations that the Party conference is going to be, to push the process of perestroyka further and further and accelerate it. But I think that at the same time there are many doubts and concerns that the forces of inertia and resistance are very powerful, still very powerful, and that they may be able not only to stem the tide of change, but perhaps even set it back by crippling it seriously. Would you agree with, that this is real?

[Plekhanov] Yes, that's a real concern and it reflects a reality that is very complex and there's no guarantee that perestroyka will be the...to the degree of success to which it's entitled. So very much depends on what people do. It's, it's a situation which will be determined by people's actions, and I think that the current political mobilization in support of perestroyka which we are witnessing now with increasing numbers of public rallies, letters to editors, participation in discussions....

[Kuznesov, interrupting] Demonstrations.

[Plekhanov] Demonstrations, all those things are absolutely necessary if the party conference is to be a success, if it's really to give the push to the process of reform that that process requires. But again, the party conference, even if it's very very successful still will not be the end of the struggle for perestroyka. It's an ongoing process, it will require several years.

[Bogdanov] It's just one stage, just one stage, important, but one stage of the process.

[Kuznetsov] Where does most of the opposition come from? We are pointing to [word indistinct] of bureaucrats but I think that the party itself is....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Pavel, my opposition, my opposition is coming within myself.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, that's the main source, right.

[Bogdanov] That's the main source of opposition. My background, my history.

[Kuznetsov] It's your history.

[Bogdanov] Yeah, my history, my background, and my generation is maybe the majority, the majority of people now.

[Kuznetsov] Well, but you're only part of the....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Yes, I am only part, but you put that, I look at that from very personal....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] There is very [word indistinct] resistance from local party bodies who are going to lose a lot, to part with some of their privileges and powers.

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes, yes, but that is another side of the story. I have a personal side, I have a personal part in all that, that's why I'm giving that answer. My struggle is...my resistance is my own resistance, and by that I would like to show to our American listeners how it is complex, how it is personal, how each of us is involved in all that. That's what I mean by my explanation.

[Plekhanov] Yes, I would like to say there are three types of conservatism that exist now in this country. First, there is a psychological conservatism, and that's the type that Dr Bogdanov has just referred to. It's a part inside most of us, I mean it's a natural feeling when you are confronting the change of this magnitude. You have to overcome something within yourself to support, to become part of it, to advocate more rapid changes. Secondly, there is dogmatic conservatism. People who are used to certain ideas are very upset that those ideas are being rejected or that they crumble down, and they say no, no, no, look, what, we're moving away from socialism, because the real socialism was something that we've had for several decades. They, not all of them admit it, but this is the socialism that Stalin built. Well, in effect we are now building a new model of socialism. And, thirdly, that there is a conservatism of those people who are simply afraid of losing the privileges and the power that they have. Now that's the toughest conservatism of them all, but that's also the least honest because really you can't defend your privilege openly. You have to hide behind dogma, you have to hide behind other....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] It sounds like a long list of opponents of....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] By the way, yes, Sergey, I believe that your analysis is very correct, right to the point, but my question to Pavel is, do you plan to inform our American listeners about day-to-day work of the conference?

[Kuznetsov] Yes, of course we will. Of course we will.

[Bogdanov] I believe it is very useful; that's very useful.

[Kuznetsov] As time is running out on us, what has the party conference to accomplish for either of you to call it a success. In your opinion, Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] In my opinion to strengthen my own belief in further movement....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] That there won't be a stop, that is supposed to...will not only continue, but will pick up speed.

[Bogdanov] Yeah, pick up speed.

[Kuznetsov] Dr Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] Well, now we have those Theses which are a platform for perestroyka. If the Theses are ratified by the party conference, hopefully with some progressive amendments which would strengthen the key elements of the Theses, I think that will be a success.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you very much, our time is up. I'm Pavel Kuznetsov your host on "Top Priority" signing off till next week at the same time and on the same wavelength. Thanks for being with us.

Referendums Possible Under Present Constitution

PM2006085788 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 14 Jun 88 p 1

[Reader's letter as part of "Our Opinion!" feature compiled by duty editors A. Gasparyan and L. Pakhomova]

[Text] On M. Rybkin's Statement (SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 31 May) [subhead]

From A. Semyachko, Kalinin:

M. Rybkin raises the question of the need to pass a law on referendums. But our Constitution contains a perfect article, Article No 5, and I quote: "Major matters of state shall be submitted to nationwide discussion and put to a popular vote (referendum)."

The only point is that, for some reason, in the 70 years of Soviet power nobody has ever (or am I mistaken?) wished to find out the opinion of **the whole people** [boldface as published], even though we have had more than enough problems.

Attitudes to Restructuring Discussed

LD2006202888 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In 8 days the 19th all-union party conference will open. Sharing his thoughts on restructuring is one of the delegates to the conference and winner of the Lenin prize, writer and publicist Ivan Vasilyev.

[Vasilyev] Reflecting now as the conference approaches, I come to the following conclusion, you see: The issue of radically changing our whole way of life has arisen. In the provinces—let me put it like this: Even in the capitals, the vigor, the energy of the discussion can be felt, but here in the provinces there is a sort of silence. A lot of people come to me, just ordinary people from the villages and the towns; and why do you think they come? To ask: Will this last for a long time, is it serious? And others ask: Why don't we have restructuring?

You see, people have the view that it is not me that is restructuring, it is not us, it is a kind of imported commodity—they will bring it to our shop, and we will drop over and buy it. This is where restructuring begins—in the mind of each person. You know, I would call our current period of time a intensified mental work by everyone. That is, everyone has to think through what is going on; and for this, information is needed, people need to be knowledgeable, and that means glasnost is needed.

So we have all this resistance from of the bureaucratic apparatus, from this huge administrative system, from all of these bureaucrats. You see, bureaucracy means providing people with a minimum of information, doing and dealing with all these things through unofficial channels, or on a collegial basis, if you want, as long as it is kept under wraps. And the main thing is that all of these people in the collegium have been elected by us, it is we who sent our representative to any given committee, but we do not know what he is doing there. We do not know how he is defending our interests, what he is objecting to, what he is arguing about, what proposals he is making. There is no openness about decisionmaking. We have become so accustomed to acting actively when we are told you get on with this, you do this....

[Unidentified announcer] You go over there.

[Vasilyev] Yes, plow the clover field, sow the maize, shut down the village, build the complex, and so on—you understand me. To this extent we are active. For years on end they have been hammering this activeness into us, and now, when we are told look, everything depends on your activeness and initiative we are lost.

[Announcer] So what is to be done?

[Vasilyev] What is to be done? Why are instructions needed, you understand? On the other hand, if we are talking about a redistribution of power, then the whole administrative apparatus should do its real job; it should provide a service to the people, provide a service to their productive activity, promote acceleration, and so on. But the local, provincial bureaucracy is still insisting on its own way tenaciously; you see, they are very arrogant. What do you mean? How is that?

[Announcer] We are still in charge!

[Vasilyev] We are in charge, and don't you forget where you are! Who do you think you are talking to? You see, one of the features of the current stage of restructuring, I think, lies in this: The closer we approach the practical, real work of restructuring—and I think that it is the conference and its decisions that will form the beginning of the practical restructuring of the system—the nearer this time comes, the greater the pressure from the grassroots level, the masses wake up.

[Announcer] So you are optimistic about the future?

[Vasliyev] Certainly. There is no way back. This is understood even by the most ordinary people.

Reader Calls for Leaders' Accountability

PM2106093088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1

[Letter from V. Bogatyrev under the rubric "Discussion Platform" and the general heading "We Discuss the CPSU Central Committee Theses": "From Words—to Deeds?"]

[Text] In a matter of a few years we have had to revise many propositions and postulates that had appeared immutable. Due credit must be given to the boldness and determination of the new leadership of the party and country in the transformations that are taking place. And the CPSU Central Committee Theses represent a good basis for a program for our further development. I would like to share a few ideas in this connection.

How can we avoid in future that elevation of one individual over everyone that is how the various cults begin? The point is evidently that the wide exercise of glasnost and democracy should presuppose not secret, but broad discussion of contenders for leadership posts in the country. All those who belong to the top echelon of power share responsibility for the policy pursued. That applied to Stalin's immediate entourage, and is entirely applicable to our own times. How could it happen, for instance, that a mortally sick man was appointed to the post of head of the party and state? After all, it was clear that K.U. Chernenko could hardly bear that tremendous burden.

The responsibility for the exercise of glasnost also rests with those who are called upon to form public opinion. There are many publications now on various highly topical themes, but where is our science? After all, we have plenty of academicians and historians who could offer profound explanations of social processes. Naturally, it is those who are not tainted with time-serving who have the moral right to do this. Science is responsible to a great degree for the democratization of society. Its prestige should be restored, with an influx of young forces.

We must, of course, study our past thoroughly, without forgetting the present day. Do not leadership workers evade responsibility even today? Look how various commissions and committees hear reports on the state of affairs in various sectors. State control, apparently. But who, as a rule, is held to account, who is punished? The deputy ministers. So it turns out that the grain rots in the elevators, they sometimes even explode, but the minister is not held responsible. Or take another example. The newspapers report from time to time that the responses to criticism, signed, again, by deputy ministers, are not in accordance with reality. But who takes the blame?

Much is currently being said and written about the rebirth of the cooperative system in the Leninist interpretation. Long overdue! But are we not forgetting, in this context, about the responsibility of the agro-industrial committee, which allowed its apparatus to swell up excessively, but did nothing in practice to improve the supply of food products to the population? It is time Comrade Murakhovskiy answered to the people, after all, he was given not only departmental power, but also state power.

The time has come boldly and openly to analyze the first practical steps of restructuring and rectify the initial errors, and this should be discussed at the party conference. For instance, the state of affairs in light industry and trade is much criticized, and rightly so. There has been no progress—neither in the quality of goods, nor in the elimination of shortages. In trade, rudeness, short measure, shortchanging of customers, and the creation of often artificial waiting lines continue to flourish. Is it not time to call the responsible comrades strictly to account—where is the influence of restructuring?

V. Bogatyrev,

CPSU member since 1948. Moscow.

Official Use of 'Cryptic Language' Criticized

PM2006080588 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 23, 5 Jun 88 p 6

[Reader's letter from Vladimir Mikhaylov, translator, Moscow: "Reading Between the Lines"]

[Text] The evening news programme Vremya on Saturday, May 21, announced the election of new first Party secretaries in Armenia and Azerbaijan, S. Arutyunyan and A. Vezirov since their predecessors, K. Demirchyan and K. Baginov, retired for reasons of failing health. The next morning, PRAVDA reported that the fact in a few laconic lines under a typically insipid heading "Plenary Meetings Were Held".

Given the brevity of the communication and the absence of any comment on the national press, one is led to believe that the event is a common one and merits no special attention. But is this really so? Of course it's natural for leaders to be replaced now and then. Nothing sensational about that. But a new man in the first secretary's seat in any Union Republic is always a major event. Especially today and especially in Armenia and Azerbaijan, republics that are in the spotlight. The names Sumgait, Stepanakert and Yerevan are on everyone's lips. No one had forgotten about what happened there. In Sumgait the rioters have just gone on trial. Now any development in Armenia or Azerbaijan is talked about everywhere.

It is under these circumstances that the change in leadership took place. And on the same day and for the same reason: "in connection with retirement due to poor health." The reports in Vremya and PRAVDA in no way attribute Bagirov's and Demirchyan's retirement to either the recent developments in Nagorno-Karabakh or to the numerous other problems which have cropped up recently in these Republics. The problems, incidentally, were described in detail by the selfsame PRAVDA, as well as by other newspapers and magazines. To what extent were the retired leaders responsible for these problems? Maybe this was what was discussed at the Plenary Meetings of the Central Committees of the Communist Party? But we aren't really sure, are we? All we see is the formula: "retired due to poor health". Logic and common sense point to some cause-and-effect relationship between the recent events and the plenary meeting decisions, while official reports maintain that it is only old age and poor health.

I think that both our common sense as well as the official report imply the same thing, and that in this respect there is no contradiction. But the official report resorts to cryptic language instead of giving it straight. We are supposed to guess that the formula about retirement and health implies censure, and be content with that. But maybe I'm mistaken? Maybe my common sense is deceiving me and the leaders of the Party organizations in Azerbaijan and Armenia themselves requested to be replaced? Is this, perhaps, what the plenary meeting discussed? Then at least that much should be stated frankly. Is it really necessary to teach us the art of reading between the lines? I'm not happy knowing that "retirement due to health problems " stands for the end of a career, and that "in connection with the transfer to another job" means, at the very least, a move up the ladder.

Authorities and citizens should not communicate through hints. They can and should communicate in a different way, truthfully and respectfully using full value (and this applies equally to both sides). Innunendos and craftiness are harmful to all: both those who understate and those who are forced to deduce. The former are deprived of trust, the latter lose their dignity.

Perestroyka is radically changing this situation. Examples of this can be seen in the information being published about the election of delegates to the 19th party conference. Since we have already started down the road to glasnost, it's probably best not to stop.

Writer Argues for 'Freedom of Thought'

PM2006151788 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Jun 88 p 1

[Pavlo Zagrebelnyy "Writer's Opinion": "Working According to Ability. But How About Thinking?"]

[Text] In Schiller's drama "Don Carlos," the Marquis de Posa addresses King Philip (and even we have learned from our not too detailed history textbooks what a sinister figure that despot was) and exclaims: "Sire, grant us freedom of thought."

It somehow happened that we never uttered this exclamation. We even seem to have overlooked the fact that Article 50 of the USSR Constitution, which lists the freedoms guaranteed to citizens, does not mention freedom of thought. And yet this is a violation of one of October's most important principles.

Is it possible to add to the Constitution? It seems to me that it is not only possible but also necessary. In any event, if we intend to continue developing glasnost and democratization in the future, the USSR citizens ought to have a constitutionally guaranteed freedom of thought.

Evidently, taking the numerous suggestions and wishes, our electoral system is going to be changed because it is now clear that it is not the most perfect system, as inveterate ideologists stubbornly claimed. If this was really the case, how come that legislative power was combined with executive power in the USSR Supreme Soviet and in all other soviets, that the ministers and other high-ranking officials who have to implement the laws adopted by the country's supreme organ are themselves members of the legislature and become deputies automatically, by virtue of their office alone? Why is it that the Soviet of Nationalities does not deal with the life of the republics but duplicates the Soviet of the Union, thus unwittingly giving rise to a suspicion that the chamber was created not to deal with real affairs but only to provide additional deputyships for high-ranking officials living in the capitals? Why is there no commission for observance of the Constitution nor arms control commission among the Supreme Soviet's permanent commissions? On the other hand, do we not have rather too many Supreme Soviet deputies? A total of 1,500 persons—are they there to do a job, or is it just a matter of giving a platform to ministers, Central Committee department chiefs, military commanders, obkom first secretaries, and other persons in positions of power?

There has been a lot of talk about the nomenklatura, about some clan of "untouchables" that gradually took shape deep inside the administrative edict system which is so close to the heart of Nina Andreyeva and Colonel Filatov, who defended Stalin's harsh decrees on the pages of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. Will we manage to put an end to the immunity [beskontrolnost] of officials at all levels by creating more and more new control organs, attaching a controlling official to almost every official? I am not too sure. Perhaps we will only increase the incidence of abuse, while the incompetence of those in power will grow further still. I would approach it differently. Since we are tormenting school pupils and students with endless examinations, wounding their young souls with cruel mistrust, why not introduce something like an "examination for office" for those who prove themselves in life, an inspection of their professional suitability (anything but, of course, the notorious certifications which give idlers and persons without any talent an opportunity to deal with all honest and talented workers!). In the union republics, such an examination must contain a requirement for fluency in the national language in addition to Russian. People who are not fluent in the national language cannot occupy leadership positions.

Our industry is quite strange. It seems that no industry like it has existed since Sumerian times (subject, of course, to the proviso that it was then known as craft). Throughout history and under all systems, industry (craft) has worked for people, for the people. Stalin managed to twist matters so that industry started working for the state, or rather for industry itself. And so it continues to this day. We have seen for ourselves over decades on end that timid resolutions to boost the production of consumer goods have no effect at all, nor can they have any effect since Its Majesty Industry has its state plans for the manufacture of something that is particularly important with a high iron content, something that is inedible, indigestible, inconsumable and...unnecessary. Consequently, until such time as we decisively demolish the entire structure of our industry and turn it so that it faces people, restructuring will not attain its lofty goals.

The life of society—especially a democratic society—is built according to the principle: You are allowed to do anything that is not prohibited by law. This was the principle on which our Soviet state was founded. It seems that it would be useful for our scientists, especially those whose careers were built on quotations from the classics, now to produce articles on Vladimir Ilich Lenin's consistent stand against prohibitions, especially when these prohibitions were in one way or another aimed against the whole people (the latest example is provided by the anti-alcohol "epic").

And what did Stalin do? He slowly and imperceptibly twisted our entire state system in such a way that virtually everything was prohibited, while people were allowed to do only what was allowed by resolutions, commands, favors, and wise instructions. Inertia operates to this day. The resolutions adopted in our country were so numerous that there was no chance to read them, let alone implement them. In addition to these resolutions, and "in amplification" of them, there were thousands and millions of instructions, orders, and explanations. The regulation of activity and life was taken to the point where all activity in general and even life itself were just about coming to a halt! But life cannot be halted!

While taking a walk once, Lev Tolstoy killed a mosquito which had bitten him. Tolstoy's walking companion remarked that this was incompatible with the theory of non-resistance against evil which the writer preached. Tolstoy became somewhat confused, and managed to produce an answer only the next day: Life cannot be regulated to the minutest detail!

Tolstoy took a day to give his answer. We have had 70 years to ponder. Today we are convinced that life cannot be regulated to the minutest detail, that we cannot sit back and wait for instructions, that the people's initiative, in their deeds and in their thoughts alike, must not be fettered.

It seems to me that this is the guarantee not only of restructuring's immediate successes but also of its future.

Public Denunciation of 'Criminals' Urged

PM2206113588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 21 Jun 88 p 3

[Extract from Daniil Granin article in book "No Other Way Is Given": "Whom Are We Hiding? Why?"—first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction]

[Text] On the eve of the 19th all-union party conference the "Progress" publishing house is publishing the book "No Other Way Is Given" ["Inogo ne Dano"]. Its authors, Academicians T. Zaslavskaya, N. Moiseyev, A. Sakharov, writers A. Adamovich, S. Zalygin, and D. Granin, journalists V. Selyunin, Yu. Chernichenko, and A. Bovin, historians Yu. Afanasyev and M. Gefter, and many others discuss the most acute problems of the life of society, restructuring, and the development of glasnost and democracy.

Today we offer readers a fragment of Daniil Granin's article.

The numerous show trials of the Stalin years formed in us distrust for these proceedings. The falsifications of the "plots" have been revealed one after another. People whose names were turned into bogeys are being rehabilitated. For my generation Zinovyev and Kamenev, Rykov and Bukharin, Trotskiy and Tomskiy were the receptacles of all conceivable sins. This was rooted in our consciousness, entered our flesh and blood from the time when the materials of virtually every one of these trials were published in virtually every newspaper. In stenographic detail, day after day—interrogations, confessions, speeches by the defendants and prosecutors, and the last words of the sentenced men. The publications played a decisive part in creating public opinion. To this day we cannot completely comprehend the secret mechanism of the spectacle of these trials. The concocted trials of innocent people were public [glasnyye] and were held in full view and seemingly for all the people. But now trials of real criminals—of those who have flouted the people's trust and mocked all principles of morality—these trials are not held publicly or are not held at all. It is hard to give an explanation of this. The need for such trials lies not only in punishment, it also lies in exposure, in feeling the fear of an ineradicable shame, nationwide shame, so that everyone can understand who is a real enemy of his people, and, of course, the need for these trials lies in the edification of dignitaries great and small. In ensuring that there is some guarantee that they will be exposed and not hidden, not covered up, but will be presented to everyone in their unseemly nakedness. As they once used to be displayed in the infamous pillory. A sword would be broken over their head. Similar "shaming punishments" used to exist.

The lack of trials of this kind and of retribution prevents us from raising the problem of repentance, gives us no opportunity of doing so. First elementary justice must triumph, and then we can turn to people's conscience.

What is preventing us from ridding ourselves of Stalinism today? Why are there defenders of that grim era and defenders of Brezhnevism—a time of stagnation, corruption, and the flouting of every principle? Who but overt criminals gained from those times? What kind of people are they who, despite numerous publications of materials and documents, do not hesitate to justify their most repulsive misdeeds?

Those who are accustomed to displaying blind trust. And those to whom it was convenient. Whom the honest rivalry of minds and abilities did not suit.

For instance a former office or shop chief, a very small-scale chief. But he was feared, people would attempt to ingratiate themselves with him, he would be praised, and was omnipotent at his post. But try shouting and swearing now. If you issue an order people will start trying to prove to you that things are not that way, that that's not right.

Take a social sciences teacher. The theme of his candidate's dissertation was "processes of the class struggle in the countryside and the dispossession of the kulaks in the thirties on the basis of Leningrad Oblast materials." He defended his dissertation in 1950 and since then has been playing the same tune. He will defend the cult as justification for his scientific work, teaching, and entire life.

And take a chemical engineer who has in addition written anonymous denunciations and was recently found out, who has somehow held onto her job; only recently she would terrorize everyone, but now no one wants to consider her.

And this timid young critic makes a career for himself in an a double-dyed Black-Hundreder [reactionary nationalist organization formed in 1905] little journal; he juggles with the facts to whitewash Tvardovskiy's critics.

And here is an official who is afraid that it may come to light that in Brezhnev's time he constructed a combine which has polluted a lake. And here too is the group of influential scientists who supported the projects for hydraulic installations convenient to the ministry and lethal to our northern areas.

These people built themselves private houses and do not want to part with them, they took apartments for their children at the expense of families who had been waiting for 20 (!) years.

They all have no hesitation in defending the former order. And who is there to feel shy of, who is there before whom to feel ashamed!

At one time the opinion of society existed in Russia. It acted in all strata. In village life in days of old it determined economic decisions and the tenor of life and assessments of the demand made on villagers' conduct.

The merchants' milieu established its own ethics, the noblemen had their own ethics—in the noblemen's assembly, in the salons, in so-called high society. A mechanism of public opinion took vigorous shape in Russian science and manifested itself. It elaborated its own requirements for propriety and norms of conduct and decency and this mechanism had its own punishment for violators.

The punishment could be severe, as in "Anna Karenina" or Ostrovskiy's plays. Whether it was fair or unfair was another matter, society had its own unwritten codes of honor and every member of society was obliged to observe them.

People were turned away from the house. They stopped being received. No hand was extended to them.

Caste-based public opinions developed moral criteria. For all their prejudices they nonetheless tried to heighten moral demands.

A remarkable physicist of our time, Petr Leonidovich Kapitsa, understood perfectly the importance of public opinion in the scientific milieu. He said that for this it was important to create a healthy progressive scientific public. A public as some kind of milieu, sphere, or melting pot in which public opinion is smelted. His renowned "kapichniki" seminars [seminary-"kapichniki"—meaning unknown, possibly derived from Kapitsa] in practice helped to form a scientific public among physicists. "That is harder than building big institutes," he remarked. "The creation of a healthy public includes educating broad strata of people connected with scientific work."

Public opinion does not require agreement, it requires an environment and an opportunity to meet, to exchange opinions, to discuss, as was the case at the rural gatherings and in clubs. To meet freely with people close in spirit, views, and understanding....

Our major scientists succeeded in creating remarkable schools—that was the case with Lazarev, Ioffe, Kapitsa, Landau, N. Vavilov, and several others. But they did not succeed in forming a scientific public. It was destroyed during the years of Stalin's repressions by the atmosphere of fear, ideological terror, and Lysenkoism which distorted the situation in many sciences. The absence of public opinion allowed careerism to flourish, cases of the forging of data and of plagiarism where people would register themselves as co-authors began to appear. The chase after titles and awards began. There was no shame in admitting people. Real talents were driven out. The academy was forced to elect people like Pospelov, Vyshinskiy, G.F. Aleksandrov, Ilichyev, and other "scientists."

The public opinion was lacking which could have protested, defended, decried impropriety, excommunicated a scientist who had violated the norms of scientific ethics. Individual scientists, the keepers of traditions, tried to express their personal denunciation and they even did this publicly, although this was oh so difficult and hazardous. The majority could not make up their mind to do this. Acts of individual courage were needed to make a man understand he had committed a base act. The system of public opinion, on the other hand, does this collectively, compels this to be done, and therein lies its strength.

Talk of propriety is vital today, although it is not simple and concepts of propriety have diverged. A man writes a dissertation for an institute director; no one condemns him for it; everyone knows he is trying to get an apartment; otherwise he will not get out of his communal apartment. A fisherman of my acquaintance poaches on the Svir and he is indignant that he has to hide from the fishing surveillance although entire schools of fish are dying at the station dam; the fish-runs are not operating, no one cares about the death of thousands of fish, "but the inspectors are chasing after us." A "take-away expert" is denounced for getting caught at the entrance taking away carburetor components for his automobile. There are none in the stores and they are expensive to buy elsewhere. His comrades condemn him not for violating the law but for stupidly getting caught.

The absurdity of thriftlessness, waste, and bungling confuses all criteria of honesty. In Leningrad entire apartments are subject to capital repair. It is technologically more convenient. And they knock down partitions and walls one after the other.... They used to do this manually, and fireplaces, railings, and doors could be preserved, but now everything is broken into pieces. It is pitiful to see molding, decorations, and valuables perishing. People have appeared who clear out apartments about to undergo capital repair. They take the tiles from the stoves, copper door handles, railings, and all kinds of valuables. Who are they? Thieves? Embezzlers of the public coffers? Yet thank God there are such embezzlers. I should like to greet them and I do not want to think that a man is obliged to commit a crime here. He is taking something that is not his, he is breaking the law. But we sincerely offer him an amnesty and defend him.

In February 1988 a fire occurred at the USSR Academy of Sciences library. It may be said without exaggeration that a misfortune befell not only our own culture but also world culture. But how did the library directors behave here? Instead of mobilizing all forces and means and trying to salvage from the fire what still could be salvaged—scorched books, books damaged by water and foam—instead of these measures they first of all engaged in misinformation. As long as they could understate the size of the disaster. They tried to prove that nothing terrible had happened, that "some newspapers of the Soviet period, some modern Soviet books..." had suffered. That is seemingly easily replaceable losses. "We are prepared to begin the library's work next day." Reassuring statements followed one after the other; the important thing was that the bosses should not be alarmed. Let's put on a carefree face and note the heroism of the staffers and the firemen; what is important is not the disaster but how wonderfully people struggled against it.

It has now become difficult to hush up this catastrophe. It has become known that 400,000 books burned and of these half belonged to the world-famous Ber foundation of the 18th to 20th centuries. As D.S. Likhachev writes, the foreign books from the Apothecaries' Office and one-fourth of the unique newspaper stock were destroyed; there are no more copies of many of the newspapers anywhere and 3,200,000 books suffered from water and moisture. Nonetheless the directors continued stubbornly to deceive the public. This deception was discovered by the press and journalists; I do not even mention the library employees. The bosses showed absolutely no shame toward them. At a meeting the director could state with supreme calm that the damage was not great inasmuch as they were books which no one asked for. The director and his deputy were both publicly caught out in their lies through the newspapers and in particular through LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA. This was called misinformation, but it was the most commonplace lying. What should a man of propriety do if he is told for all to hear: You are a liar! It is proved to him, he is caught out. He should, as they used to say, burn with shame. Retire. Cease to appear in society. But it seems that is not the case. He continues to operate and to act as chief with supreme calm.

In the backroom premises of the library I walked through piles of damp ashes mixed with carbonized files and shreds of burnt pages. The library's young employees and students had spent umpteen weeks moving the singed remains of newspaper pages into a neighboring room and hanging them on lines to dry. The neatly stacked piles were newspapers waiting their turn to be dried. Volunteers were working and trying to save the newspaper stock from which the library had dissociated itself, which it had written off. The boys stopped the excavator when the directors tried to to remove the fire's "ugly traces" as rapidly as possible. Incidentally, from these obstructions saved from the excavator's scoop they dragged 250 intact books from the Ber foundation. That is how propriety comes up against impropriety. It is no surprise that they describe their bosses' actions with a grimace of disgust:

"Soon after the fire Leonov, the library deputy director, left to spend 10 days in Geneva."

"Why?"

They shrug: He is applying for the post of director of the UN library.

How, at the height of such a calamity, such a terrible catastrophe, can he drop everything, leave everything, for what?

They look at me in bewilderment, expressively, with a bitter smirk: To whom are the motives for such conduct more obvious than to all of them: What does he care for the fire if he has an opportunity to travel to Geneva, let the entire library burn.... That is how they interpret his behavior but he has not even thought to explain himself to them, to justify himself.

And suddenly I remember Kaysyn Kuliyev, sorrow over whom still constricts my heart. I remember how at the end of the war, when he was in hospital, the wounded Kaysyn learned that his Balkar people had been forcibly moved from the Chegemskoye Gorge to Kirghizia. When his wound had more or less healed, in 1944 he left, walking with a stick, and Nikolay Tikhonov told him that after considerable trouble he had managed, as an exception, to get permission for Kaysyn to live where he wanted. Except Moscow or Leningrad. That was taking into consideration Captain Kuliyev's services and the fact that he was already a well-known poet. Kaysyn was an exception; he did not accept this privilege. He did not want to leave his people at a difficult time and he followed them to Kirghizia.

In 1975 I flew with him to Frunze. Kaysyn showed me where he lived, how he went to register, how he was mocked as someone without rights. He had doomed himself to this voluntarily. And I never heard him boast about it. Propriety was manifested in him not only through deeds but through his attitude....

If you take recent decades, here is what is remarkable—they have given us above all the "heroes" of stagnation. Glasnost has revealed a whole gallery of thieves, deceivers, virtuoso embezzlers of the most varied calibers, heroes of cynicism and duplicity, underground business and ecological piracy.... Their names have become well known: Academician Zhavoronkov, the "hero" of Lake Baykal, Voropayev, the "hero" of the diversion of rivers, the participants in the Rostov affair, "leaders" like Bodyul, Kunayev, Medunov, and Adylov, the "hero" of the Uzbek dungeons.

From time to time stories of persistent fighters for the truth appeared. They included virtually no top-rank leaders. Where are they, these heroes without quotation marks? From whom were we to take an example, who were we to believe?... For some reason I have remembered an increasing number of honest, bold, idealistic heroes who suffered defeat, destroyed by the machinery of the Administrative System.

With some incomprehensible, almost morbid, persistence we return to the past, to the years of the cult, the years of stagnation. What are we seeking there? Probably a guarantee above all. How to prevent a repetition of the past. How to protect ourselves and the future of our children. We are seeking psychological, material, and political guarantees.

In a discussion I heard the following opinion: Instead of really changing life, instead of that, they are seeking enemies who must be vanquished.

The restoration of propriety is the restoration of exactingness toward the law, toward what is right. There should be denunciation. Both legal and public. We cannot live alongside villains and informers, exchange caresses with them or extend a hand to them. Propriety is intolerance for, contempt for dishonesty, baseness, and immorality. Denunciation should be not only public but also legal. But above all everyone must be cited by name. That is a good medicine for society's moral renewal. It is obvious now how our indiscriminate tolerance inspires our adversary and demoralizes our allies. In Chimkent former oblast leaders headed by the obkom first secretary had criminal charges brought against them. They had involved over 4,000 people in criminal activity and embezzled R25 million. And a few months later it emerged at a party aktiv (in April 1988) that the number of official and other crimes in Chimkent had not declined but increased.

Exposing probably means dethroning the bearers of the deformities of social evil. Discrediting requires arguments, requires that we show in public the penury and nullity of the inner nature of these degenerates.

Engendered by the stagnation period which itself was logically generated by Stalinism, today they are merging with the defenders of Stalin. Using Stalin, they are attacking restructuring and ascribing to it corruption, accidents, since all these things are now being published. They are not merely delaying—they are trying to reverse restructuring; after all nothing threatens them. It is not enough to condemn Stalin and Stalinism, they must evidently be condemned by all the laws of right and ethics. People may say to me that it is not a writer's business to accuse or persecute but to stand up even for the guilty, once they have been condemned and are being punished. But they are not being punished, and this can be felt now as what is perhaps the most agonizing social injustice.

Stalin's Backers 'Slander Working Class'

PM2006135988 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 22, 29 May 88 p 12

[Professor Anatoliy Butenko article: "The Braking Mechanism and the Usurpation of Power"—boldfaced as published]

[Text] My article entitled "The Braking Mechanism: What It Is and How To Combat It", featured at the end of last year, not only continues to arouse comment from readers but has also been mentioned repeatedly in scientific discussions and disputes mirrored in the press (cf.:"VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS" No 2, 1988).

Naturally, like any author, I have been greatly inspired by positive comments from readers. S. Kozlov (Moscow) is grateful to MN and the author (me) for being able "with much frankness and honesty and in a way that is quite easy to understand" to "give vent to what has built up in the souls of so many of our citizens." Ye. Strepetov (Leningrad) believes that in their interpretation of the "braking mechanism", the author and the editors "have set forth the steps necessary to overcome it, as well as thoughts about ways of furthering socialist democracy from its present stage." V. Kuznetsov (Brest Region) maintains tat the article poses "Major problems" and contains the necessary "theoretical propositions relating to the essence of the negative phenomena which have emerged in our society."

I find it particularly noteworthy that many readers sent in detailed responses to questions under discussion and even articles containing interesting observations, valuable remarks and original proposals.

For instance, one G. Vyatkin wrote the following: "Stalin and his entourage usurped power and created a system of government under which all state and party body functions merged together and became concentrated in the hands of a small group of leaders. On why Stalin was successful in this we have no answer. But we desperately need one, since the choice of the means with which to overcome the braking mechanism is directly dependent on it."

However, although they may be less agreeable, in some sense I find those comments which voice disagreement and cite objections to the author's position more valuable than positive ones. One thing is certain: There are always lots of opinions.

One G. Khodzhayev (Moscow), for instance, not bothering to offer any proof, considers the article "basically wrong" and sees it as a "sample of pseudoscientific verbiage". His displeasure essentially boils down to the formula: "It's wrong to blame everything on Stalin's errors", and in connection with this he writes: "Aren't we, in our hot pursuit of what's fashionable, forgetting the ideological orientation of all our publications?" We could reassure him by saying: "No, we aren't." But in so saying we remember Lenin, and we remember that propaganda and counter-propaganda based on fear of the truth aren't worth a nickel. Or, take V. Lobanov (Leningrad) who not only criticizes the article, but socialism itself in the belief that socialism as it exists today cannot guarantee freedom to the individual, "which is why it is doomed" and any reforms are pointless. He claims that perestroyka is doomed as well, and for some reason in connection with this lashes out against the anti-alcohol campaign, which he claims "is considerably accelerating our collapse. Already during Brezhnev's time there was a saying: 'In our country he who doesn't work shall not eat, but he who does work shall drink.'" How can you object to the author of this letter if the letter contains no serious arguments against the positions stated in your article?

As far as arguments are concerned, plenty more can be found not so much in letters from readers as in discussions that were held on the braking mechanism and in which objections were voiced to some views contained in my article. I'm primarily referring to a discussion, which took place last October at the CPSU Central Committee's Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

Naturally, I will not touch upon the remarks that were made with which I agree, but there were some which I simply must take to task. The strongest objections to the Marxist formula "usurpation of class rule"—used in my article to refer to the time of the Stalin regime, the period of mass repression and lawlessness—were raised by those who deal with these questions professionally, i.e., students of party history, historians and philosophers, teachers and lecturers. What is the crux of their position?

Those who are against accusing Stalin and his cohorts of usurping class rule are on the surface pursuing a full commendable aim—preventing our socialist reality from being "denigrated", and not allowing "simple-minded" advocates of perestroyka, as Professor M. Dobruskin, D.Sc. (Philosophy), from Kharkov puts it, to go "to the length of denying the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peoples' state", and preventing them from "making the shortcomings of our political system an absolute".

Let us now turn to the logic behind the reasoning of such "critics", and why it is unacceptable.

As is often the case with those who defend Stalin, their primary concern is to vilify their opponent, presenting him as a conduit of bourgeois views. Thus Professor M. Dobruskin writes: "...Justice demands that we admit that Butenko is by no means the discoverer of this 'new idea' (Usurpation of power—A.B.). It's the spitting image of writings more than 40 years old by the American bourgeois politologist Burnham ('revolution of managers') and the Yugoslav revisionist Djilas ('new class' theory)."

The next step is to "catch" my ignorance of Marxism. "Sensing the weakness of his own concept," the professor writes, "Anatoliy Butenko tries to reinforce it with quotations from Marxist-Leninist classics who allegedly foresaw the possibility of power being usurped.... The author provides no references in support of his 'forecasts' for the fully understandable reason that they would amount to a total disproval of all of his views."

Although the Doctor of Philosophy, Professor M. Dobruskin is convinced that Marx could never have spoken about the danger of class rule being usurped and is, therefore, quick to accuse the author of having "simply confused Marx with ... Bakunin," let me suggest that he take Volume 22 of the **Collected Works of Marx and Engels** (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1986) and open page 488. Looking at the state policy forms of social development, Marx writes of the "constant danger to government represented by the usurpation of class rule". Moreover, he explains that there is often a governmental usurpation of class rule, due to the fact that a whole class cannot squeeze into one government chair, and that there is also a more formidable usurpation which arises with the emergence of a sole political candidate looking to "make all classes happy."

In defending Stalin and his entourage against the accusation of "usurping class rule", M. Dobruskin is convinced that he is taking a principled stand because he's defending the dictatorship of the proletariat from "attacks." But, like many other defenders of the Stalinist deformations, he fails to notice that by rejecting what they see as "ideological danger," they find themselves in a very awkward position in terms of ideology. What do I mean by this?

First and foremost, in insisting on such a position for the sake of "saving the honour" of their native country, such defenders are prepared to discredit the dictatorship of the proletariat as an international socio-historical phenomenon. Indeed, by declaring that it still existed in the Soviet Union in the 1930's they, wittingly or otherwise, thereby prove that everything perpetrated by Stalin and his entourage was compatible with the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the power of the working class and all other people, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat tolerated mass reprisals against the finest representatives of the working class just as it stood lawlessness, arbitrary rule and despotism.

Secondly, by rescuing the formula, mastered over many decades, of Soviet power as a state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, forgetting Lenin's opinions about the possibility of having a different social composition in the Soviets, and believing that the formula is hard-and-fast no matter what the activities of the authorities may be—even when the bodies of Soviet power, on Stalin's personal instruction, used torture ("method of physical pressure") on Lenin's associates—the defenders fail to see how they are thereby simply slandering the Soviet working class, which, they believe, retained its political power at that time and therefore carries the full weight of historic responsibility for the crimes committed by its alleged class power.

Thirdly, in further support of their position, the defenders pretend that they are not against Marxism and Marx's warnings about the danger which was later realized in the Soviet Union, but take exception to individual mistakes by individual authors and newspapers, in this case **MOSCOW NEWS**. Indeed, was the formula "the government usurpation of class rule" really invented by me rather than Marx? Why pretend that the dispute is with Butenko, when in fact the real purpose is to call into doubt the warning of Marx? Especially since

M. Dobruskin himself, not knowing Marx, didn't even try to show why Marx's formula cannot be applied to the Soviet Union in the period when the Stalin personality cult was flourishing.

Fourthly, the opponents claim that they criticize "Comrade Butenko's erroneous views" and, moreover, his "basically incorrect understanding". But why not then say bluntly that they also take exception to the CPSU documents dating back to the time of the 20th and 22nd congresses? Or perhaps they are unfamiliar with these documents? Well, as a certain saying goes, practice makes perfect, and in keeping with this, let me remind them about what was said at the 22nd CPSU Congress: "At the time of the personality cult, the party was deprived of a normal life **People who usurp power** cease to be accountable to the party—they are beyond its control. This is the chief danger from the personality cult." As you can see, the "usurpation of **power**" by certain individuals was recognized at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. Moreover, it was emphasized at that time that the chief danger from the personality cult stemmed from such usurpation, and the usurpers' being beyond the party control.

Volkogonov Book Tells 'Truth' About Stalin

PM2106142988 Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Jun 88 p 4

[Interview with Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Professor D.A. Volkogonov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Defense Military History Institute, by A. Tsyganov: "D.A. Volkogonov: Truth Purifies. Noted Soviet Scientist Reflects on Stalin and Stalinism and on the Dramatic Lessons of History"—first parargraph is TRUD introduction]

[Text] The 19th all-union party conference is drawing near. Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Professor Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Defense Military History Institute, has been elected a conference delegate. The conversation with him is devoted to burdensome pages from our history and the conclusions we must draw from the past. The complex topic of Stalin and Stalinism, which demands in-depth interpretation, is within the range of his professional interest as a scientist.

[Volkogonov] The course chosen at the April 1985 plenum is vitally necessary. There is simply no reasonable alternative to revolutionary restructuring. There is sufficient unanimity on this point. But the conference delegates have to think of and decide on the methods to be used in the pursuit of a breakthrough and the means to be chosen.

It seems to me that the two key points of renewal or, to be more precise, of a Leninist revival are as follows: First, a decisive improvement of the economic situation. Second, a broad democratization. All this presupposes the existence of genuine people's power which would boost to the utmost the value of every Soviet person's rights, and especially of his social and moral responsibility to society, to history, and to himself.

It seems to me that quite an important position in the solution of questions of renewal today is occupied by a genuine study of all pages of our fatherland's history with which people are, unfortunately, still insufficiently familiar. History is the people's memory which makes it possible to acquire truthful knowledge of what has happened, which in turn is necessary in order to create what is necessary. Truth purifies, even though it often causes pain. And this pain can be acute and prolonged....

[Tsyganov] Is this what you are writing about in your book?

[Volkogonov] Yes, now I am working on the book "Triumph and Tragedy" [Triumf i Tragediya], devoted to what are probably the most dramatic pages in Soviet history, the time of Stalin's one-man rule. I am trying to analyze the personality of Stalin himself and the sources of his ideas and actions, as well as the causes of the "Caesarism" and the unbelievable repressions which befell the party and the people. I am trying to comprehend the lessons of the triumph and the tragedy of the period from the twenties through the forties. I want to show how one man's triumph can end up as a whole people's tragedy.

[Tsyganov] It is more than 30 years since the 20th CPSU Congress, which first raised the question of the destructive consequences of Stalin's personality cult and mapped out the way to overcome it. Unfortunately, however, our people still have not learned everything about many things. What can be said from today's positions about Stalin's personality and his position in our country's history? Could our society have managed without the ugly phenomenon of the personality cult? Many of TRUD's readers write to the editorial office asking these questions.

[Volkogonov] A very wise thought was expressed by Jean Jaures, a great French socialist: An historian is entitled to produce his counter-hypothesis to accomplished facts. In my view Stalinism, the cult of the Leader's [vozhd] personality, and the perversions of socialism were not at all mandatory or fated. It is evident that the very first step which could have been taken in line with Lenin's wishes in the Letter to the Congress that Stalin should be removed from the position of general secretary could have saved us from the subsequent events which inflicted such a gaping and bleeding wound on the people's soul. And had there been development of the democratic foundations of party and state life bequeathed by Ilich (and in particular the determination of, for example, the length of time a general secretary may remain in office), had the mechanism of succession of power, monitoring, electability, accountability, and broadest democratization been implemented in line with Lenin's legacy, I think that there could not have been the slightest chance of any illegalities occurring. The nature of one-man rule is rooted in the democratic imperfections of the system, the absence of a reliable mechanism of social protection against abuses, and the poor standards of political culture at the time. There were, of course, also external causes of the cult: The constant threat from outside encouraged centralization and the restriction of democracy.

People sometimes say: "We won victory," "we built," and "we accomplished" with Stalin. Of course, it would absurd to deny that we achieved quite a lot in terms of creating a mighty industry, new production relations, and a new culture. Despite the deformations and illegalities of those years, socialism demonstrated its advantages in the last war and in many other respects. Despite all this, however, I am convinced that we would have won victory, we would have built, and we would have achieved a lot more, at the cost of less bloodshed and fewer privations, without Stalin and Stalinism. It was only the tremendous and pure charge of October that made it possible to preserve the fundamental moral values of socialism during the time of Stalin's unbridled terror.

Take for example the thesis that we won victory thanks to Stalin. Here are the facts. All military district commanders without exception and almost one-half of corps and division commanders were repressed just before the war. Almost 40,000 men of the Red Army's top and middle command structure were destroyed between 1 May 1937 and 1 September 1938! Assuming that a platoon commander's training requires at least 6 months, and that was the time allowed for it even in the most difficult period of the war, how much time is required to train the commander of a division, an army, or a front? Our armies and divisions were at times commanded by people without the required experience and knowledge. Many of them did their best, but at what cost in terms of sacrifices and bloodshed! Let alone the unique value of human life itself....

[Tsyganov] And what happened to their ideas?

[Volkogonov] It was indeed not only people but quite often ideas as well that perished. In general, I must say that our military theoretical thinking was at its height during the thirties. Svechin, Triandafilov, Tukhachevskiy, Isserson, and an entire series of other theoreticians were voicing ideas, very progressive for the time, on mobile warfare, active defense, and the use of large masses of tanks.

It is well known that Stalin revised the country's defense plan three times just before the war. And the general secretary turned it down twice. Why? Simply because the General Staff had assumed that the main attack would come from the west, along the shortest route to Moscow. But Stalin still adhered to his Civil War views and forced them to rework the plan. The main attack's direction was assumed to be from the south. This involved changes in the disposition of troops, and efforts were not concentrated in the direction where they were needed. Later on, in 1942, Stalin committed a similar "reverse" mistake. At that time he insisted that troops concentrate in the west, while the Hitlerites actually rushed to the Caucasus in the south.... There you have the cost of the strategic "genius" of the future generalissimo. Yes, in 1943 and after Stalin no longer committed such miscalculations, but credit for this is due not only to him but to all top command organs.

There were also political mistakes. Until the very last moment, Stalin did not believe that Hitler would attack our country. Just a week before 22 June he said that war was unlikely, at least until the next spring. Even though he had at his disposal all the reports to the contrary from intelligence, from diplomats, and from deserters. The 14 June TASS statement of sad memory, which misguided Soviet people rather than the fascists, pursued a perfectly specific objective: to challenge Hitler to new talks. And they could have been dragged out. June, July.... The fascists would not have launched a war in August—winter would have been just around the corner. But Hitler's perception of these issues was no worse than Stalin's. He did not bite the bait.

[Tsyganov] And how about the nonaggression pact between the USSR and Germany? In his notes "Through the Eyes of a Man From My Generation," K. Simonov writes about the confusion it generated among the people. There are contradictory attitudes to the treaty to this day. Was it a mistake or was it, on the contrary, a wise political step?

[Volkogonov] Indeed, there are to this day very many critics of that pact. Especially abroad. Many claim that it paved the way to World War II, that it was a betrayal of the West. But I think that truth must come above all else. While condemning Stalin for a lot, we must say that his main objective—to put off the war—was correct. He did a lot in pursuit of it, even though he was grossly mistaken as regards the means. Nor must it be forgotten that both Poland and the Western countries had concluded nonaggression pacts with Germany before we did. We were not the first to take this path. After all, we did propose the creation of a collective security system. It was turned down. Stalin had talks with the Polish ambassador about allowing passage for our troops to the Polish-German border to guarantee Poland's security, to which our own security was linked. But the answer was negative.

Therefore, even though the pact appears morally dubious, it nonetheless did play its role in slightly delaying the war. But the real and unforgivable blunder was committed 1 month later, on 28 September. Once again in Moscow, Molotov and Ribbentrop signed once again in Stalin's presence a—just look at its title!—pact "On Friendship and Borders." A pact on friendship...with fascist Germany. There is no need for any further comment; even without it, everything looks sacrilegious in the extreme.

That was the time when Hitler sensed that Stalin was prepared to make any concession just to prevent war. He became even more brazen. The pact "On Friendship" disoriented the people's fronts, the antifascist forces, the communist parties, and the Communist International. We found ourselves in deep international isolation. In actual fact, this immorality in the selection of means—Stalin's main feature—produced results which were directly opposite to what was intended: Hitler was encouraged, the antifascist forces were demoralized, and our own moral image was damaged. All this had its effect on the course of the war.

[Tsyganov] Did Stalin himself realize, albeit with hindsight, that he was making mistakes? Or did he really believe himself to be infallible? Generally speaking, what is your opinion of the man's psychological makeup?

[Volkogonov] The war changed Stalin quite a lot. He became more "earthly," and the "divine" somehow evaporated from him. He sensed that he was also capable of making mistakes, and catastrophic ones at that. Stalin became—if this word could be applied to him—simpler, he sensed that the question of not only our state's but his own individual existence depended solely on the closeness between the leadership and the people, on the total mobilization of the people's entire spiritual and physical energy. Even though he again reverted to "his old self" after the victory.

Generally speaking, this man's psychology was, to put it mildly, very unusual. For example, Stalin had boundless faith in paperwork. If he were shown some document stating that some person was an enemy, as a rule he always believed it. There is almost no instance of his rejecting a denunciation as false, naive, far-fetched, or simply provocative. His love of paperwork, the apparatus, the bureaucratic system, and the hierarchy is perhaps one of Stalin's psychological features.

Stalin was an exceptionally secretive person. Many tried to guess his opinion. Some succeeded in this. Beriya, for example, was distinguished by a knack of guessing right more often than the others; he was proud of this, and used to say that he "thought like Stalin." Generally speaking, however, the "Leader" usually concealed his true intentions even from his closest associates. Whenever Stalin pursued some major goal, he took a long time and proceeded with cautious, small steps. But he was also exceptionally persistent and consistent, stopping at nothing. Especially in the struggle for power, for the implementation of some idea of his.

I am convinced that, on the whole, this man's psychological features are primarily attributable to the fact that he was a dogmatist—in the set of his mind and his character alike. He saw it as perfectly natural that, since he professed Marxism-Leninism, everything he said was the ultimate truth. Try and read any one of Stalin's major works: He often quotes his own words. The quotations were, moreover, treated as classical, immutable, and absolutely correct. He only comments on them.

At the same time, spiritually Stalin was profoundly alone. Imagine a despot who has nobody to argue with, nobody to justify himself to, nobody to explain himself to, nobody to excuse himself to. No matter what he said, everything immediately became "great, brilliant, and unique."

Even so though, and despite his rational, sly, and perfidious brain which of course did not lack practicality, Stalin was nothing but a theoretical popularizer. He had no idea of political economy, even though he wrote the "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR." (As a matter of fact, this work was not written by him.) Stalin experienced even greater difficulties with philosophy. True enough, he did produce one work, "Marxism and Anarchism," which is primitive. Stalin did not manage to shine as an original theoretician like, for example, Bukharin, who promoted original ideas even though they were at times either arguable or mistaken. During the twenties, professors from the Industrial Academy and the Communist Academy started visiting Stalin two or three times a week to give him lectures which were officially described as consultations. Sten, one of the famous philosophers, worked with him and drew up a program designed to brief Stalin on classical philosophy and the works of Hegel, Kant, Feuerbach, and Fichte. But the brain of this former religious seminary student proved unprepared to assimilate such complex material. Sten disappeared without trace during the thirties.

Stalin became an active popularizer of Leninism. He outlined Lenin's theory in simplistic and primitive terms. Many of his articles and speeches are so full of quotations that if some article were to be "pruned down," we would be left with nothing but punctuation marks. Here, incidentally, is a description of Stalin as a theoretician. He was a man who thought along catechismal lines and loved to classify everything. "Four aspects" of opportunism, "three aspects" of the Red Army, "four aspects" of production, equally as many aspects of Trotskiyism—everything classified. But all this lacked dialectical depth, and this encouraged dogmatic thinking.

Stalin was a great hypocrite. I would even say a gifted actor. He played to perfection the role of "father of nations," "troop commander" [polkovodets], and "leader" [rukovoditel]. He usually concealed his cruel qualities in public. But on one occasion, for example, no sooner had Air Force Commander Rychagov expressed disagreement with the "Leader" on the high incidence of accidents, than he disappeared without trace a week later. Even Poskrebyshev, his closest aide, who worked with Stalin for more than 20 years, fell victim to Stalin's punitive machine. Poskrebyshev's wife was arrested on Beriya's decision. She was not even allowed to write a letter. And even though Poskrebyshev went down on his knees to beg Stalin for mercy, assuring him that she and her three children could not have been spies, the "Leader" was unmoved. He only said that it was all in the NKVD's hands, that he was totally uninvolved in it, and "could do nothing to help...."

As a matter of fact, I did come across a case when Stalin reprieved someone. One of the weekly reports to Stalin on the number of death sentences signed by Vyshinskiy and Ulrikh mentioned that it would be inexpedient to execute one of the condemned since he was dying of cancer. Stalin resolved: "Agreed...."

[Tsyganov] And what were those around Stalin like? In your view, what were their personal qualities, the degree of their loyalty to Lenin's ideals and principles?

[Volkogonov] I think that these people, in their overwhelming majority, primarily had blind faith in Stalin. They were people incapable of independent thinking. They totally accepted the bureaucratic, barrack-room concept of socialism which Stalin preached. Like him, they believed that socialism could be built through the dictatorship of the proletariat, recognizing only one of its aspects—the violence. But violence is not its sole and by no means its main aspect....

For 30 years our state and our party were led by a man who essentially had no profound professional foundations. He was virtually without specialization. He was a man who lacked proper knowledge of the life of either workers or peasants. To all intents and purposes, Stalin had never—a few extremely rare exceptions apart—visited kolkhozes, plants, or the front. Many of those around him were exactly like him—no wonder we experienced at that time the flourishing of "people's academicians" with only high school education but well versed in revolutionary phraseology. By the way, many of the "Leaders" of that time had no idea about the real workers' life. Molotov himself graduated from a nonclassical secondary school and essentially had no practical experience in production. Malenkov, a student who never graduated, prospered as a technical secretary. Kaganovich was a bootmaker.

Stalin personally selected his entourage. It was no accident that, by the end of the thirties, Stalin was the only survivor of those who had been elected to the Politburo under Lenin. All the others had been destroyed as "enemies of the people." In this case Stalin—being and exceptionally sly, perfidious, and rancorous person—followed the old rule of dictators. He did away with those whose character he knew from before and during the revolution, and promoted those who owed him something—or, even better, everything. After all, during the revolution Stalin was 10 or even 15 rows back in the formation of Lenin's cohort. I consider him no more than a persistent and willful executant. Later on, however, pushing everyone aside, he made his way from deep inside the cohort to the front line of the column, and later took up position at its head. This advance was swift. Had someone told Stalin back in Turukhansk in 1917 that in 5-6 years' time he would be one of the top men in a colossal state, he himself would have probably treated it as a stupid joke.

Here is something that amazed me. Working on the book, I reread all the volumes of Stalin's works. Including the "Questions of Leninism," an anthology of his articles whose 11th edition was published in 1945. It contained speeches he had delivered in the twenties and thirties, in which he polemicizes, abuses, criticizes, and demolishes Zinovyev, Kamenev, Trotskiy, Sokolnikov, Krestinskiy, and many others. Let me remind you that none of them was alive by that time, he had destroyed them all! But even in 1945 the book was published in the same way as "then"—he addresses them in the same fashion, as if they were still alive. It was terrifying: Stalin was still fighting against ghosts. Once the machinery of illegality had been set in motion, it carried on demanding that victims be thrown into it, the living and even the dead....

[Tsyganov] But was there nobody in the party who could have halted the man who considered himself the sole arbiter of people's fates?

[Volkogonov] There are several aspects to this question. First of all, it cannot be denied that, as far as the mass of ordinary people were concerned, Stalin was actually the personification of socialism. He made himself the symbol of socialism. Essentially, everything that Stalin did unquestionably became the official line, perceived by everyone as the will of the party and the will of the people. This is why it was hard to struggle against him, even though there were people who felt that terrible mistakes and crimes were being committed. But anyone who attempted to speak about it would certainly have been perceived as an opponent of socialism.

This is one aspect. Here is another. It perturbs me more than anything else, both as a man and as a scientist. Even in the most difficult and unusual situation, man always has a chance to follow his conscience. Even if it is only his last chance. I realize that destruction would have befallen anyone who had stood up at a Politburo session, a Central Committee plenum, a congress, or some major meeting and said: "Comrade Stalin, what are you doing? Are these really our enemies? Where are we heading? Why has the axe of terror been applied to the best members of our party, to Lenin's guard?" It can be assumed that such courage of conscience would not have vanished without trace because the statement would have been heard by the party. This probably could not have halted the repressions, especially at their later stages. There are, nevertheless, certain abiding values—truth, goodness, nobility, honor. And yet the chance to display these qualities, this chance to follow one's conscience, was rarely utilized. On the contrary, an atmosphere of denunciation developed, mingled with fear, suspicion, mutual mistrust. And all that was thickly covered with glorification of the Leader....

Of course, we know of quite a few people who found the courage to speak the truth, to say what they thought of everything. If only everyone had been equally determined to take the chance to follow his conscience! Ultimately, the cult was not created only by Stalin himself; it was also created by others, by his entourage. In this context, we all bear responsibility for it. After all, are we using an abstract term when speaking about the decisive role of the people's masses? This role is played not only "ultimately." It is also played in the ability to express collective attitudes to phenomena which fall outside our value concepts, outside our ideals.

[Tsyganov] What are the specific features of your work on the book about Stalin, what difficulties have you encountered, and what task have you set yourself in researching such a contradictory phenomenon in our fatherland's history?

[Volkogonov] I think that the book would have caused contradictory responses even if its writing had been assigned to a Nobel Prize winner or a major collective of academicians and it had been brilliantly written. There are different opinions on Stalin. Only the comprehensively researched truth—and not immediately, either—makes it possible to elaborate an integral attitude to this personality and everything connected with him. Hence I have no illusions. My concept is based on just one premise: to tell the truth on the basis of documents. I have no desire either to make up to anyone or to pamper anyone's taste. I am neither a Stalinist nor an anti-Stalinist; I am simply a man who believes that this dent in our history's shield must be described. And corrected by truth. The tragedy of the people linked with this man's "triumph" is a perpetual reminder for us. I think that, the sooner we clarify the profoundly confused past ideas about this man, the better it will be for us all in the future.

Of course, this affects many people. Especially elderly people. What does this all mean? Were all their labor, work, deeds, and accomplishments in vain? No, they were not in vain. Everything was ultimately done for the fatherland's sake, and all this still remains in our total spiritual and material potential. I have worked in many party, central, military, and juridical archives. I have talked to dozens, if not hundreds of people who personally knew Stalin. At the same time, this is not a political biography but a political portrait. And what I am trying to do is express my opinions, thoughts, and reflections about the past on the basis of documents, materials, and testimonies.

[Tsyganov] Today, when so many articles are being written about our past, is there not a danger that a timid and superficial approach might be adopted toward the elimination of "blank spots?" After all, an analysis of the past demands in-depth analysis, competence....

[Volkogonov] I, like many others, was captivated by Stalin in the past. Today I do not want to say with hindsight that I always believed Stalin to be a criminal. No. I was like all the others; I also felt that Stalin was an exceptionally great figure who had accomplished a lot, a Leader, and so on. I recall how we, as young lieutenants, felt his death very deeply, how we wept. This is hard to imagine today. But public awareness must open its eyes. This has been very long in coming.

The history of the Great October Socialist Revolution shows that the people's power is supreme above all else. But the people can exercise their power and their will only if they have genuine and proper leaders. But they must act in conditions whereby they are subject to total and in-depth monitoring by the people. In other words, conditions of genuine people's power.

To put it briefly, the leader, the masses, the people, and the party must be profoundly interlinked within the framework of a genuinely democratic structure. And I am glad that I will soon have an opportunity to participate in a forum which gives hope that this structure will be consolidated. We must not miss the historic chance to follow our conscience. With our knowledge of history, we can say that the present has not yet been completed, and that a start has been made on the future.

Interviewed on Stalinism

LD2106183888 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1400 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] The prominent Soviet military functionary and political researcher Dmitriy Volkogonov has written a book on Josef Stalin entitled "Triumph and Tragedy," which will soon be on sale. The other day an excerpt of this book was published by the leading soviet daily PRAVDA. The deputy editor in chief of Radio Station Peace and Progress, Aleksandr (?Kushnir) met Prof Volkogonov and asked him to reply to a number of questions.

The first questions posed to Colonel-General Volkogonov, who is currently director of the Institute of Military History of the USSR Defense Ministry, were: Was Stalin's personality cult inevitable? And: What had contributed to the creation of a regime of personal power and despotism in this country? Replying to these questions, Dmitriy Volkogonov said

[Begin Volkogonov recording in Russian, fading into English report] Was Stalin's cult inevitable? I believe that there was no such inevitability, says Prof Volkogonov. If the delegates of the 13th party congress in 1924 had heeded Lenin's opinion outlined in his letter to the congress and had replaced Stalin from the post of general secretary this alone would have to a great extent been sufficient to prevent all the possible tragic results for this country through the creation of his cult. It should be noted that the personality cult in itself is not merely a negative quality of Stalin; the absence of moral principles and the absence of understanding of the gist of humanism—the personality cult is a whole specter [as heard] of reasons which existed at that time. Now, what were they? In the first place, consideration must be given to the democratic bases that had been laid down by Lenin after the revolution and which unfortunately had not been developed after his death. The democratic potential which is contained in socialism itself had not been developed. This is the very depth, the reason for the appearance of all cult anomaly.

In the second place, one cannot help seeing that in tsarist Russia there were practically no democratic traditions. Caesarism and tsarist traditions were most vital. And with the comparably low cultural level of the overwhelming masses of the peasant population in Russia it became possible and, I would say, even a prerequisite that any powerful personality that would come to the surface would enjoy support from the broad masses of the people. For many centuries the Russian people became accustomed to having autocracy.

And in the third place, I would like to note the circumstance that the autocracy that had finally emerged in this country was to a great extent the result of the fact that Stalin, who became head of the party and the state, had most skillfully utilized one such trick. In his struggle with the opposition and factions—in essence it was a struggle for selecting the method of development, what methods to utilize for building socialism—Stalin took upon himself the role of sole interpreter of Leninism and anyone who disagreed with him and his opinions was in disagreement with Lenin and was therefore opposed to Lenin. And all opponents proved to be helpless in the face of such oversimplified logic of Stalin. He took over and in actuality usurped the right to interpret Lenin.

Sometimes people say that Stalinism as such is nonexistent. I believe, says Dmitriy Volkogonov, that there is Stalinism, or to be more correct there was, and echoes of Stalinism still exist.

Now, what is Stalinism? In my opinion, it is a distorted theory and practice of socialism. I wish to stress this: a distorted theory and practice of socialism. And Stalin became the symbol of this distorted theory and practice. The question naturally arises: Why did the party, the Central Committee, and the masses of people tolerate this distorted practice? It is because Stalin had created an image among all what precisely socialism should be. And it is quite true that in the first years quite a lot had been done. The land was handed over to the peasantry who had cultivated it, factories and plants were collectivized, broad steps were taken in the cultural sphere, illiteracy was wiped out and many other positive measures came with socialism. But at the same time the democratic mechanism of power was not developing. For instance, if it had earlier been determined how many years a general secretary could remain at his post, if the mechanism of changing power, of rotation, interchangeability, accounting, and strict control by the masses of the activities of the leaders had been determined, then there simply would not have been any cult distortions.

Consequently, the cult was not inevitable. But the reasons for the appearance of the cult are linked with a whole series of objective circumstances and I would like to speak about one of them in particular, because it is seldom mentioned at present.

The circumstance that the young Soviet Russia was surrounded by capitalist countries contributed to the limitations of democracy and the strengthening of centralism. One cannot discard the fact that the capitalist world looked at the first state of workers and peasants with hatred. And this state, which was still not strong, was obliged to constantly worry about withstanding, about surviving in this troubled, complicated, and speedily changing world. It was necessary to create the industries, the military industry, and the Army and this to some extent justified centralization because the country had to be a single camp. And Stalin utilized this factor to the maximum for consolidating his personal power.

Historians will yet write a great deal of the Stalin phenomenon, the reason for the coming into being of the personality cult. But already today it can be said that the main reason for all the negative developments in our society about which we are now speaking openly was the mechanism of personal power. The authority of a person not limited by democratic attributes and laws and without any public control are always dangerous. Therefore, I believe that the renewal that our country is now experiencing—not a simple one, a complicated one—is the only alternative to what had been before. [end recording]

Question: Sometimes in the press of some countries there appears such reasoning: The Soviet Union is now rejecting the Stalinist period, therefore it is rejecting socialism altogether. Professor, what can you say on this matter?

[Begin Volkogonov recording in Russian, fading into English report] Today, says Prof Dmitriy Volkogonov, on the eve of the party conference and at the party conference itself, we must make the choice: what socialism should we reject and what socialism we wish to build. We must reject the socialism that had been connected with Stalinism. Of course, we do not categorically reject everything that had been before. Our people have created the material and technical bases of socialism. Much has been done and a high level of culture has been attained. We have been victorious in the war. But I declare with full conviction that without Stalin we would have attained much more.

What type of socialism do we wish to build? I would say scientific, Leninist socialism. Some might declare: Formerly, you used to say the same thing. Yes, we did. But we wish to fill these words with genuine democratic and humanist content. When power will really belong to the people, when glasnost will be safeguarded by laws, when real guarantees will be created to make it impossible for the return of such anomalies as in the past, then genuine Leninist socialism will have been built. And I am confident that the 19th party conference, of which I have the honor of being a delegate, will deal with these questions and will make an important step forwards toward genuine implementation. [end recording]

Economic

Economist Outlines Strategy for Restructuring

PM2106121588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences Professor V. Kossov under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "On the Economic Strategy of Restructuring"—boldface as published]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th party conference note the need to accelerate the resolution of problems on which the complete implementation of the principles of economic reform depends. In this connection I would like to examine, albeit in a simplified way, the range of questions that determine the shaping of the economic strategy of restructuring. It is important to recognize that we are capable of much more than the standards to which we became accustomed during the long years of stagnation.

The economy's resolute turn toward satisfying Soviet people's needs and the overcoming of the tendency inherited from the past of the autarkic development of sectors require profound structural changes in the economy. The main deep-lying changes and reserves lie in a major structural restructuring of the economy, as M.S. Gorbachev has noted.

We are used to judging the growth of our wealth in terms of rates. But the unsatisfactory structure of the economy devalues them.

According to USSR State Committee for Statistics figures, in 1986 our national income was 66 percent of that of the United States, as against 58 percent in 1960. This would seem to be a considerable reduction in the gap. But simple calculations show that, given the growth rates achieved in the last 25 years (and these were on average 80 percent higher than U.S. rates) Soviet national income should have exceeded U.S. national income by 3 percent. But in practice it turned out to be one-third less. Why? The reason lies in the lower efficiency of our national economic structure. The conclusion is obvious: Economic development strategy should be linked not only to changes in its **sectorial** structure via the preferential growth of individual sectors, but also to changes in the specialization and even sectorial jurisdiction of many enterprises.

The results of our economic competition with the United States over the last 25 years have been quite modest: Labor productivity in industry grew from 44 percent of the U.S. level in 1960 to 55 percent in 1986, and in agriculture it froze at the 20-25 percent level. From these facts it is already obvious that an advantage in terms of rates is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for winning the economic competition with capitalism. A sufficient condition is the **selection of modern avenues of development** that determine the nature of structural changes in the economy. These are taking place in two main areas: the acceleration of the development of sectors making up a modern economy, and the elimination of inefficient structures and the winding up of "traditional" types of production.

We lack the latter of these two areas that ensure the restructuring of the economy.

Interpretation of the path we have traveled and the experience of other socialist countries allow us to formulate a number of tenets which, I think, could be seen as a basis for the economic strategy of restructuring. Chief among them **should be the division of enterprises and spheres of activity into two zones—the planned and the regulated.** In the planned zone, the state determines what is done, while in the regulated zone it defines the conditions for enterprises' existence.

This proposal is linked to another—the elaboration of targeted programs as tools for shaping plan targets and economic policy, tools to regulate economic activity. The fundamental feature of these programs is that they determine the place of each economic component in raising labor productivity in the national economy by 130-150 percent by the year 2000, which would make it possible to **assess each component on the basis of a criterion that is the same for everyone.** This is an exceptionally important point.

For practical solutions we need methods that make it possible to assess the contribution of each major project to achieving this overall goal. The interdependence of projects and the range of questions which they raise are linked in targeted programs. Another conclusion from the programs must be regulatory measures—from price formation to taxation policy. Under these conditions 5-year plans would be a projection of the programs for a particular period.

The number of consumers could clearly be taken as the main criterion for the division of enterprises and spheres of activity into two zones. Given a large number and the ensuing diversity of demand it would be expedient to include enterprises in the regulated zone.

In circumstances when the number of consumers is limited—military equipment, custom-made types of output, the development of fundamentally new types of production—or when a product is uniform in its properties, like electricity, it would be expedient to retain the existing planning system, whose essence is the targeted creation by the state of capacities ensuring the satisfaction of public demand.

All economic practice—both Soviet and that of other countries—unambiguously points to the **impossibility of managing enterprises via combinations of planning and regulatory methods** since these methods are based on mutually exclusive approaches. The attempt to "combine" both approaches in the same enterprise will lead to one principle invariably suppressing the other. In our conditions, regulatory methods will be suppressed, since party and economic organs are responsible for plan fulfillment. In practice the slogan "The plan at any price" will remain the main rule of behavior.

Economic policy includes an arsenal of methods and means ensuring the resolution of the following tasks: the acceleration of development; stabilization and maintenance of the chosen course; and the social protection afforded collectives and individuals. We will look at these tasks in more detail.

The acceleration of development will undoubtedly remain the prerogative of centralized planning, whose task is to create an organizational structure ensuring the speediest materialization of scientists' discoveries and inventions. The creation within a tight schedule of production facilities geared to meeting the demands of the world market is an indispensable condition. World practice shows that a producer of new types of output retains a monopoly position for around 5 years.

One-fourth of all the world's scientists work in the USSR. If we are able to make better use of their scientific developments—and this includes exchanging experience in return for foreign researchers' discoveries—I think we will then be able to master half the results of scientific and technical progress. In order to pay for the other half, we will have to increase exports. Unfortunately, it is still hard to count on our scientists coming up with one-fourth of world achievements. A graphic basis for this fear is provided by the figures for Nobel Prizes awarded in the three fields of medicine, physics, and chemistry. Our countrymen have won 10 times fewer prizes than U.S. and British citizens, making due adjustment for population.

Another weak link is the introduction of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, which is graphically visible in the structure of raw materials exports.

How can the situation be radically changed? First and foremost, it would be expedient to reveal all the potentially promising areas in which Soviet science is a leader—to define the "growth areas." The next stage is to create in these areas independent structures headed by an ideas man and entitled to enter the world market directly.

It is no less important to allocate resources for the accelerated creation and development of growth areas that would secure a monopoly in the world marketplace.

The efficient utilization of the latest types of equipment and instruments in the national economy is a separate issue. In order to resolve this task it would clearly be expedient, where technology permits, not to distribute the latest means to consumers but to create **economically accountable [khozraschetnyy] firms to utilize them in major industrial centers.** This is a way to solve the problem of the accelerated creation of leading-edge production facilities that determine the face of the modern economy.

However, the greatest effect each year is produced not by fundamentally new production facilities, but by numerous improvements to products and technology. Central authorities cannot force enterprises to carry out this work, but they can and must interest collectives in so doing. Regulatory methods are aimed at achieving this. An important condition of acceleration is to organize a taxation policy in the second (regulated) zone of the economy which will encourage enterprises to undertake capital investment to ensure the accelerated improvement of production facilities.

And, of course, a most important element of the acceleration strategy is to get rid of inefficient producers—something which administrative management methods are simply powerless to do. The experience of the numerous reorganizations in agriculture is graphic confirmation of this.

The stabilization of development. The main role here should be played by the transition from the central allocation of output [fondovoye raspredeleniye produktsii] to wholesale trade. **The management of the market is becoming a most important planning task**, which in turn can be broken down into a number of separate problems: the definition of price-formation rules, price controls, and the prevention of speculative price hikes by high taxes on superprofits.

It is no less important to correctly formulate a taxation policy that is uniform across the entire country. The "personalization" of taxes for certain enterprises or rayons should be categorically forbidden. Tax breaks—for instance, the accelerated writing off of funds for sectors which it is particularly desirable for society to develop—could be used as a tool of this policy.

The third particular task concerns the subsidies (negative taxes) granted by the state to production facilities or rayons with a high development priority.

And, finally, the fourth task is to manage interest rates as a most important means of combating economic "overheating," which leads to inflation. The state, by raising these rates, restricts the availability of credit and thereby reduces the tendency for prices to rise. To stimulate economic growth the reverse policy is pursued—cutting rates makes credit more easily available, which makes less efficient investment possible and increases the demand for resources, thereby tending to boost prices.

Implementation of this approach will be of little value if banks remain issuers of funds to the enterprises registered with them. They must become proper economically accountable enterprises investing funds to earn profits and competing with each other in the search for customers.

In order to stabilize development, it is also important to carry out an organizational restructuring of economic life, which should, I think, be deepened. Above all we must not tolerate producer monopolies. Customers must be given the real right to freely select their suppliers or opt for imports.

Competition to ensure the best utilization of the public property granted to collectives must be the main rule for their behavior.

The transition to the second model of economic accountability. Implementation of this tenet is linked with the substantiation of a "fair" level of taxes paid by enterprises, and with the distribution of enterprises' net income and particularly that part of it which goes to workers (labor remuneration) to stimulate high-quality labor. The main shortcoming of existing pay schemes is their wage-leveling nature. Wage-leveling results in the disappearance of the most highly skilled workers, which has even become a subject for works of art.

Compensation for damage caused by violations of contractual commitments. The violator compensates the victim for all the income that the latter lost because of the failure to make deliveries. This is a draconian measure, but unavoidable if reliable supply is to be organized, and without that economic accountability becomes a fiction.

Social protection. The transition to the extensive utilization of methods of regulation and economic competition carries with it not only the hope of salvation from shortcomings that annoy everyone—such as shortages and low-quality goods—but also dangers stemming from the essence of these methods. Particular mention should be made of the impermissible gaps between families' income levels, which could result in the appearance of a stratum of people of independent means—that is, people who do not work but live off inherited wealth. At the moment there is only a handful of such people. It is therefore all the more important to consider in good time just what progressive taxes on personal income and legacies should be. These elements are virtually undeveloped in this country, and stress is laid in restricting income received, that is, on a leveling system of distribution. It is very important, however, to avoid going to the other extreme and raising taxes so much that any desire to show initiative is crushed.

Our economic practice is full of examples of impermissible interference in enterprises' economic activities. We need a categorical ban on noneconomic coercion. No organ—state or social—is entitled to force an enterprise to carry out any work, save in exceptional circumstances.

The most complex part of restructuring is the **transitional period**, during which the role of the old system of assessments is weakened while the new system is only emerging. It is during the process of the transitional period that the essence of changes may be watered down with the help of various "amendments" and "amplifications," and old content squeezed into a new form.

The most delicate aspect of the transitional period is coordination with decisions that have already been made. That is why the expedient division of enterprises into two zones should be taken into account when drawing up state orders. For the planned zone, state orders would be drawn up to provide almost full loading of capacities, while in the second zone the proportion of state orders would gradually fall to nothing by the end of the transitional period.

The first thing that must be done when working out normatives is to eschew their "personalization."

The next fundamental step is to reject high overall growth rates, while relying on high and very high rates in "growth centers." The length of this period of some restraint on overall rates will directly depend on the speed with which the regulated zone is set up, and would clearly take 3-4 years.

The second fundamental step is to gradually replace centralized funding—particularly for enterprises in the future regulated zone—with subsidies, tax breaks, and other measures that would give producers a vested interest in spending their funds carefully.

In order to ensure the successful organization of the transitional period it is necessary to resolve a number of questions.

Demand must be restricted, thereby releasing some resources. Demand must be effectively balanced [spros dolzhen byt platezhesposobnym]. The prime condition for this is strict control of the money supply. In the production sphere we should above all abandon "intensive" plans and base calculations on 85-90-percent utilization rather than 100-percent utilization of capacity. This solution will make it possible to remove the substantial strain in relations within the economy, will make enterprises more mobile, and will face them with the need to seek out work for themselves.

The regulated zone should be consistently expanded concentrically outward from enterprises specializing in consumer goods production to enterprises producing raw materials. This process should take several years—one group of enterprises per year, for instance. The switching of enterprises to the regulated zone could be accompanied by a corresponding change in their place in the administrative structure. The best solution is independent enterprises competing with each other to meet demand.

Supply should be increased, above all, by changing enterprises' specialization while restricting demand for their traditional products and switching enterprises to the regulated zone.

For instance, in comparison with the developed capitalist countries, we have an overblown agricultural machine-building sector, even though there are shortages of many important machines. In terms of total engine power, Soviet tractor production is 150 percent higher than production in the United States. There is much higher production of other agricultural equipment too. As a result, more petroleum products are expended on a lower volume of output.

Our trading system is currently suffering owing to a shortage of goods, and unsatisfied demand is growing. A large new plant is needed to produce automobiles, but... a tractor plant is being built. The importance of this maneuver is also determined by the fact that for the first time in many years, consumer goods production is without a clear market leader with a double-digit growth rate. In the sixties such leaders were large domestic electrical goods, tape recorders and televisions; in the seventies it was cars, color televisions, and tape recorders; and in the eighties, just cassette decks and VCR's.

The "thinning out" of the list of goods whose production is growing at a high rate indicates that industry essentially has little to offer to meet the population's unsatisfied demand. This task cannot be quickly resolved without converting capacities to consumer goods production.

We must create an efficient system for increasing the mobility of factors of production—fixed capital and manpower. Along with economic measures, the purposeful retraining of the work force—which is also important as an element of social protection—is of particular importance. The basis for such decisions is the recognition that the main reason for our economy's inadequate dynamism is not a shortage of resources but their irrational use.

Restructuring is reminiscent of a walk along a mountain ridge, with an abyss on both sides. On the right is the desire to carry out restructuring in a formalistic way and fill new forms with old working methods. One of these is to develop new methods by creating additional capacities for getting rid of inefficient production facilities. On the left is the idea of jumping the gun and pushing production on with "intensive" plans that generate a desire for "willful" leadership methods.

Recognition of these dangers will help us to choose the only possible path, guarding it against disruption with the help of legislation and the restructuring of management. The basic decisions have already been taken. The main thing is to scrupulously carry them out and further develop socialist democracy.

Gosplan Staffers Assess Economic Reform Problems

PM2106103188 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by Candidates of Economic Sciences V. Smirnov, S. Sinelnikov, and A. Vissarionov, staffers at the USSR Gosplan Scientific Research Economics Institute: "Illusions and Reality of Economic Accountability"]

[Text] It is evident that the course of the implementation of the radical economic reform will be a central issue at the 19th all-union party conference. The CPSU Central Committee Theses correctly note that the time which has elapsed is not sufficient for fundamental economic transformations. We are now living through a kind of transitional period and we are at the very start of the journey.

By way of a debate, we should like to express our opinion of the progress of reform based on the analysis we have conducted of the results of the work of enterprises of the five industrial sectors which were the first to begin to assimilate the new model of economic management.

The main conclusion of our studies was unexpected and even "frightening." Virtually all the most important indicators for enterprises working on the basis of the principles of economic accountability [khozraschet] and self financing were lower last year than the previous year. The fulfillment of delivery commitments deteriorated markedly in the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems, and the Ministry of the Automotive Industry. Labor productivity growth rates declined in all sectors except the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry. The profit plan was not fulfilled. By the end of the year many enterprises were on the verge of financial collapse.

The comparison of these results with the annual results of the work of industry as a whole provided nothing reassuring. True, average indicators in the economically accountable sectors are somewhat better. But the differencee is so small that it gives no grounds for speaking of any marked advances. For instance, the fulfillment of the sales plan with a consideration for deliveries was slightly higher here (0.4 percent). But there was exactly the same correlation a year earlier, before the transfer to economic accountability. You need a very rich imagination to see the influence of the new system of economic management here.

Nor did the first quarter of this year, when the law on the state enterprise came into force, bring any breakthrough. The main results of the work of industry under the conditions of economic accountability are so far failing to justify the optimistic forecasts. The outwardly more favorable results are explained to a decisive degree by two circumstances: the low base of last year and the uneven distribution of the plan into quarters, when the main load is in the second half of the year.

It must be frankly said that this is the first time we have encountered this situation. Formerly it was precisely at the first stage that progressive innovations produced a considerable result. That was the case at the beginning of the 1965 economic reform, during the recent wide-scale economic experiment. It is particularly important to investigate what has happened now seriously and without bias, without panicking.

Many different causes usually influence a particular result in the economy. To get to the thrust of the matter, you have first to single out among these reasons those which are purely external and do not depend on the new mechanism of economic management.

The 12th 5-Year Plan itself, compiled by directive methods, was primarily such an external factor. It arbitrarily included rapid production volume growth rates which were designed to ensure the necessary acceleration. But the "demand the impossible and you will get the maximum" principle does not apply in economics. An overloaded plan reduces the efficiency of the enterprises' work to an even greater degree than an underloaded one. Artificial lashing on through the plan violates rhythm, causes a chain reaction of stoppages and delivery breakdowns, and ultimately deprives the collective of any interest in struggling for the plan's fulfillment.

The unsatisfactory overall result has also been influenced by the justified strictness of state reception. At a number of enterprises, 10-20 percent of output prepared for dispatch was rejected as substandard, which led to a deterioration of all indicators.

Now let's take a look at how our sectors look financially and technically.

Every other enterprise of the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems and the Ministry of the Automotive Industry and every third enterprise of the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building joined in the reform with a shortage of their own working capital, or to put it simply with great debts. About 15 percent of plants and associations were completely loss-making. Is there any need to explain that the transition to self-financing merely aggravated their problems at the start.

An analysis of fixed production capital also revealed a dismal situation. Completely worn-out machinery and equipment accounted for nearly one-third of the total at the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry, about 20 percent at the Ministry of the Automotive Industry, and about 15 percent at the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems and Ministry of Light Industry. Let us add to this a fair proportion of obsolete equipment which does not meet modern requirements, and the picture will be clear.

We realize that the economic reform is not some magic switch by which you can force industry to instantly rotate more rapidly. You cannot discount objective difficulties so simply. But the economically accountable sectors were in this sense on an equal footing with the backward sectors. And if they have worked virtually no better than the others, we must obviously raise the question of the imperfection of the actual economically accountable model in its 1987-1988 form.

A sociological poll last year showed that 10 percent of leaders, about one-third of engineers and technicians, and over half the workers had in no way felt any transition to the new conditions of economic management. From this we can obviously draw two conclusions. First, concerning the poor standard of cadres' economic training. And, second, concerning the nature of the real changes in management—they are imperceptible.

Indeed, let's take a look at what specific changes have taken place. What actually enables us to talk about enterprises' transition to the economic accountability and self financing regime?

In broad terms there has been just one change: The enterprises must now earn their own economic incentive funds. These funds are formed from the enterprises' own profit on the basis of stable proportion norms. This opens up an opportunity for making the collective's income dependent on the end results of its work.

But under the conditions of the existing 5-year plan, the normative method of distributing profit has proved to be merely a new face of the old administrative methods of management. Enterprises were promised that they would elaborate their own production program for themselves, proceeding from centrally established normatives and control figures reflecting public needs. The result was the complete opposite. Individual normatives for mutual relations with the budget and sectorial ministry are now derived for each enterprise from directives established by the center. Under the conditions of the continuing departmental diktat, the notorious leveling down continues to flourish, with the profit from strong enterprises being redistributed in favor of weak enterprises and depriving the former and the latter and others of the incentive to work better.

State orders, which are of a directive nature and encompass nearly the entire production program, and individual normatives—all this contradicts the internal logic of economic accountability. The idea is that without any urging, economic accountability should force the labor collective to act in such a way as to achieve the highest possible production results—to its own benefit and for the benefit of the country. And we are trying unsuccessfully to adapt economically accountable levers for the fulfillment of a plan compiled with virtually no participation by the enterprise. And we obtain the opposite effect—the struggle for a reduced plan.

Restructuring will become reality if it does not proceed along the avenue of substituting concepts—an avenue well trodden during the years of stagnation.

Or we will, as before, first elaborate a 5-year plan in order later to derive normatives from it, distorting its initial sense and control figures and the state order. This path means the former restriction of the independence of the basic link and essentially the curtailing of reform. Or else economic normatives, alongside control figures and state orders, will become the basis for elaborating plans at the enterprises themselves. And then the labor collective will steer production to the satisfaction of its consumers' diverse needs and not to the unconditional fulfillment of directive targets imposed from above. The plan will cease to be something alien and external for the collective.

The restructuring of management has so far not affected very important links of the economic mechanism such as material and technical supplies, price formation, and the credit and finance system and the procedure for the payment of labor has essentially remained unchanged. It is clear that until the full implementation of the package of measures envisaged by the Party Central Committee June (1987) Plenum, the economic reform will inevitably be of a limited, transitional nature. In this truncated form the new system of economic management is generating fair criticism from "the right" and "the left"—both from the covert adversaries of restructuring and from the champions of even more radical transformations in the economy.

In this situation is it worth forcing on industry's transition to this system in the present 5-year plan? A complex question. It would seem that a negative answer to it is predetermined by last year's poor results. But that is not so. In our view the arguments "for" are far weightier.

First, there is no guarantee that the 13th 5-Year Plan will be much better than the 12th—as yet we are unable to plan from below, "from the enterprise." Second, even in its transitional version, the new economic mechanism has considerable potential for expanding the independence and responsibility of the basic production link on the basis of the Law on the State Enterprise.

But real independence cannot be ensured by decrees alone, it must be studied. And the greater the number of enterprises drawn into this process, the more successful study will be. After all, for many years strict punishment was exacted for any display of initiative and enterprise going beyond the framework of instructions. Now only practice can make leaders believe that "everything is permitted which is not forbidden by law." In exactly the same way, higher ranking organs of management cannot unlearn by decrees alone the habit of commanding which has become truly second nature for various ranks of bureaucrats.

Without expanding the scales of restructuring it is impossible to finish all components of the new mechanism of economic management. Yet there is already something to "finish." For instance, we must stringently limit the proportion of the state order in the total volume of output, renounce our understanding of this order as an ordinary enlarged entry in the products list, and make the state order advantageous to the manufacturer by guaranteeing sales and the priority payment of accounts and tax and credit benefits. Justified economic normatives must be established with a consideration for the state of fixed capital and other objective conditions of economic management and not those convenient to the departments. The transfer to the wholesale trade in the means of production through the free sale of all output not encompassed by state orders must be accelerated.

Today economic science is blatantly lagging behind economic life. The necessary clarity is lacking on the fundamental question of the limits of full economic accountability under the socialist method of production. And only extensive practice will help to establish a sensible correlation between centralized and decentralized capital investments, between the state order and wholesale trade, social guarantees and the differentiation of incomes, and so forth.

The Party Central Committee Theses rightly stated that, in deriving lessons from the initial stage of restructuring, we must accelerate the solution of the problems on which the full implementation of the principles of economic reform depend. We believe that for the further lateral and in-depth development of progressive transformations, the maximum use should be made of the remaining years of the present 5-year plan. Putting this off to the start of the next 5-year period means merely aggravating the difficulties.

Shmelev Attacks Bureaucratic Management Methods

AU2106145788 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian
20 Jun 88 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Professor Nikolay Shmelev by Raycho Radulov, TRUD correspondent in Moscow: "Without Artificial Obstacles to Economy and Society"—"Three Basic Ideas Expressed by Prof Nikolay Shmelev to Our Moscow Correspondent. Attack Against Bureaucratic-Administrative Management Methods"]

[Text] The 19th CPSU All-Union Conference opens in 8 days. Our Moscow correspondent met Professor Nikolay Shmelev, the well-known Soviet economist. The interview began with questions about the further development of the Soviet economy.

[Shmelev] If the conference achieves progress in the three spheres I am about to mention, it would be a splendid achievement: First, it would be an important step forward if the process of cutting down on the party's economic functions, especially as regards the party apparatus, should begin. I think that the conference may and will express its stand on the artificial obstacles impeding the new reforms in the economic mechanism. Second, I am convinced that the new law on enterprises is presently paralyzed by the bureaucratic authorities. The ministries are unwilling to relinquish their grasp on the enterprises which continue to be under their control.... Third, if the conference should approve an additional incentive regarding the elimination of administrative pressure over our economy, if the system of lease in the organization of the agricultural sector should gain any support, this would mark great progress.

[Radulov] Numerous experts point out that the production volume has decreased in recent years.

[Shmelev] I am convinced that, for the time being, we do not need any increase in our production volume. If we should obtain a zero growth in the production volume, this would be only to our benefit, and not to our disadvantage. We need a growth only in the rate of our technological development. Let us take an example: We are producing 800 million pairs of shoes annually and we are importing 100 million more pairs, but it is just impossible to purchase a decent pair of shoes in our country: We are buying only imported shoes, while the rest is stored in warehouses, where the goods are perishing. Let us compare this situation to conditions in the United States where only 300 million pairs of shoes are produced annually. The question is that we should produce decent shoes! If the growth in this production volume is nil, I should be satisfied as an economist. If there should be a decrease in the production volume, it means that our economy is recovering from the insanity of striving for a quantitative increase, regardless of the existing needs.

[Radulov] On the eve of the All-Union CPSU Conference, Soviet media are writing about and readers voice their protest against bureaucratic-administrative methods of economic management. What is the conclusion to be drawn, what should be done?

[Shmelev] I am convinced that we do not need dozens of industry ministries. We just need one ministry—of trade and industry. The great disadvantage of these bureaucratic institutions is that they are not held responsible for any of their decisions and actions! Their responsibility to the higher authorities is of a party-political nature, but they have no responsibility toward the lower echelons....

What should be done? It is unnecessary to search for new forms: such forms already existed in the twenties! Syndicates with ministerial functions operated efficiently in those days. However, unlike the present-day ministries, they were self-financing institutions, whose resources were provided by the enterprises, and they were responsible to the enterprises. If the work of the syndicates proved to be inefficient, they lost the confidence of the enterprises and were deprived of their financial resources. This simple truth determined everything. If we should make up our minds to talk about such a change, I think that this would solve the problem of ministerial bureaucracy as well and the question of its resistance to the restructuring process. If we should change the functions of the ministries, the bureaucratic apparatus would be automatically curtailed. Nevertheless, this is an extreme point of view and you can imagine that only a minority of people shares these ideas.

[Radulov] In this context, are you in favor of eliminating the State Planning Committee?

[Shmelev] Why should it be eliminated? Is there a society able to live without a general staff? According to our ideal, the functions of the State Planning Committee consist of planning the strategy of nationwide capital investments, planning 20-30 percent of the enterprises' production, while the rest should remain at the disposal of the enterprises.

[Radulov] Lively debates on state and party monopolies have been recently conducted: what do you think about the state monopoly, particularly in the foreign trade sector, is it not an instrument of stagnation?

[Shmelev] I wrote 25 years ago that it is not obligatory to preserve the monopoly of the Foreign Trade Ministry. All other ministries and enterprises are state-owned. Therefore, it does not make any difference which part of the state organism should be in charge of relations with foreign countries. In my opinion the monopoly lies in the right and obligation of the state to develop the strategy of foreign economic relations. There are elements of stagnation, but they are not so important, even if they are essential. The more important thing is the fact that our goods are not competitive.

[Radulov] Your articles in the NOVIY MIR journal evoked great interest....

[Shmelev] It is difficult for me to evaluate this response. Presumably, opinions differ. It is known that Mikhail Gorbachev supported my analysis, but did not agree with all my conclusions expressed in the article: "Credits and Debts." This is natural: He is practically responsible for all our actions. I am just a professor and it is easier for me to express my views on all issues, even to voice extreme opinions. Nevertheless, the article in question did not fail to exert its effect. I think that I was able to touch upon problems which concern numerous people, if not all of them. A considerable part of these issues will be discussed at the forthcoming party conference.

Merits of State Acceptance System Questioned

PM2106132588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Jun 88 First Edition p 1

[Three letters and editorial commentary carried under the "Topical Theme" rubric: "The State Acceptance System"]

[Text] A Little Less Beating on the Drum [subhead]

I would like to broach the question of the state acceptance system. Where will you find in the press or other documents analysis of the positive and negative aspects of this innovation? Nowhere. You will only find fanfares. Is it really like that? Not at all.

In addition to protecting against out-and-out shoddy work, the state acceptance system lengthens the manufacturing cycle, increases the size of the monitoring apparatus, and delays the manufacture of new products, often out of purely formal considerations. The state acceptance system, no matter how you regard it, has weakened the principle of one-man management at the work place and introduced the factor of unprofessional subjectivism that is inherent, as a rule, in all inspectorates.

I think it is time to make the following proposal: Until more radical decisions are adopted, it is necessary to limit the state acceptance system's powers to strictly one function—the acceptance of finished goods. And let us have a little less beating on the drum about the results of the state acceptance system.

V. Khoruzhiy, engineer, Chernovtsy

Who Assesses Quality? [subhead]

The Lubenskiy "Kommunar" Machine-Tool Plant failed to meet its machine-tool production target last year. The reason? The plant was not ready to work under the conditions of the state acceptance system.

Who, then, was to blame for the the situation that prevailed at the plant? A. Pizentsali had worked as chief engineer at the "Kommunar" plant for around 30 years. And then suddenly he became... leader of the plant's state acceptance system.

Toward the end of his work as chief engineer he gave the go-ahead to automated machine tools for grinding crankshaft pins. Despite the fact that these machine tools had very serious design faults, dozens of them were sent to customers. The plant produced almost R2 million worth of rejects. How could the "Kommunar" plant's former chief engineer suddenly become the leader of the state acceptance system?

Yet the introduction of the state acceptance system was the only right decision to make. The quality of machine tools produced by the plant has improved. People' attitudes are changing. Many people already appreciate that it is no longer possible to work in the same way as before.

V. Bratchun, deputy chief of the Technical Control Department at the Lubenskiy "Kommunar" plant, Poltava Oblast.

Come and You Will See [subhead]

Our "Ammofos" Association in Cherepovets produces multipurpose mineral fertilizers. The collective is a pacesetter in its sector. After the introduction of the state acceptance system our work did not change. Only people now feel on edge and harassed. Twenty-eight people are working in the state acceptance service. Far from all of them are conscientious. They reject output that meets the state standard.

Come and you will see that we do not need this state acceptance service. It is necessary wherever output is not in demand. Whereas our fertilizer sells very well.

V. Prisyadko, section chief, member of the CPSU since 1965, Vologda Oblast.

Quality assessment is not generally unambiguous: The same person can assess a product in quite different ways. While a worker is operating his machine tool, producing components, sewing shoes, or assembling television sets, he overlooks the quality of his work in pursuit of quantity. But as soon as the shift is over and that worker enters a store and becomes a customer, he regards the goods which he himself has produced differently: He is indignant that the store has no decent shoes or clothes and becomes exasperated when a new television or car breaks down.

In view of this very casual attitude to the quality of work on the part of some people and the very high demands of those same people as customers, it was necessary to introduce a state acceptance system that is subordinate to the USSR State Committee for Standards and independent of enterprises and the pressure of quantity targets.

Some 2,200 industrial enterprises and associations are now working under the state acceptance system. What does their experience show? The quality of machinery, machine tools, equipment, and goods manufactured at those enterprises has increased. Whereas immediately after the switch to the state acceptance system only half or slightly more goods were accepted the first time, the situation has now improved.

Ninety-two percent of goods were accepted the first time in April, according to the USSR State Committee for Standards. But the output rejected for good in the first 4 months was worth R27 million. And that is a lot.

The state of affairs regarding quality at enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, Ministry of the Automotive Industry, and Ministry of Light Industry and in a number of other sectors is worse than the industrial average. In April alone, 1,700 machine tools, more than 18,000 vehicles, including 10,300 cars, 22,000 tape recorders, 30,000 color televisions, and 113,000 pairs of children's shoes were rejected on first submission.

Here are a number of specific enterprises where the quality situation is particularly unfavorable: These include today collectives of the Zaprozhye "Kommunar" Automobile Plant, the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building's Novorossiysk "Krasnyy Dvigatel" Plant, Tashkent's "Krasnaya Zarya" Sewn Goods Association, and many others. PRAVDA's readers would like to hear very quickly from those collectives as to what they are now doing, in the runup to the 20th all-union party conference, to rectify the situation.

The letters published today confirm the diverse views held on this topical question. Some writers consider that the state acceptance system needs to be strengthened and expanded to embrace all subcontracting enterprises involved in production—from raw material through to finished product. Others, like reader V. Prisadko from Cherepovets, think that they can do without the state acceptance system, since their goods—mineral fertilizers—are gladly bought by farmers as it is. One cannot agree with that opinion.

A number of letters say that the state acceptance system overloads the monitoring apparatus and makes it much more costly. Of course. The Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant, for example, has around 2,000 inspectors. With the introduction of the state acceptance system the number of inspectors increased by 180. Not such a big increase, but then more than 95 percent of all the plant's output is accepted the first time and the quality of the vehicles has become even higher.

In short, the state acceptance system is a measure prompted by today's realities. Only when all collectives dramatically increase their demands on the quality of labor and output as required by restructuring will it be possible to consider reducing the inspectorate.

More Cooperatives Established Since Law Passed

LD1706091788 Moscow TASS in English 0756 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—TASS correspondent Kirill Dibrova writes:

Less than a month has passed since the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted a law on cooperation in the USSR but the number of cooperative ventures in the country has increased by almost a thousand to reach over 20,000 during this time. Cooperative societies now employ more than 300,000 people.

The lack of a legal basis—a state law to regulate the spheres of the cooperatives' activity—largely constrained an expansion of the cooperative movement in the country. The Law on Cooperation, that enters into force since July 1, 1988, is meant to lay down this basis. The number of cooperative societies is expected to increase at least one and half times by the end of the year.

The successes of the cooperative movement are obvious: the value of marketed output produced by cooperatives amounted to about 330 million rubles in the first quarter of this year whereas the figure for the whole of the last year was 350 million. Leonid Kunelskiy, member of the Collegium of the USSR State Committee for Labour and Social Issues, holds that by the end of this year the indicator will reach two billion rubles.

Outstanding problems still remain. One of them is price setting. It is an open secret that prices for cooperative consumer goods are very high. An official curb on prices will not produce results, Leonid Kunelsky believes. This would bring about a sharp reduction in the flow of goods to the market. A gradual saturation of the market and increasing competition among cooperative societies themselves and with state-run enterprises will help lower prices for the output produced by cooperatives.

Agricultural

Nikonov Visits Kurgan, Chelyabinsk Oblasts

Addresses Oblast Aktiv

PM2106140188 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Jun 88 pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "Party Backup For the Solution of Social Tasks"]

[Text] Kurgan, 11 Jun—People perceive a strong social policy through new accommodation, kindergartens, the strengthening of their health. This was stated today at a meeting of the party and economic aktiv which examined the question of the party organization's tasks in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution "on the Kurgan Oblast party organization's work on the social development of the countryside."

The meeting was addressed by V.P. Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Our country is at a drastic turning point, he said. Restructuring has entered a new, most difficult stage—the stage of transforming what has been conceived into real deeds aimed at the all-around improvement of Soviet people's material and spiritual life.

The CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference emphasize particularly strongly that one of the main priorities in the party's activity is a strong social policy. The social orientation of economic development must be made the priority of all work. Priority should be given to satisfying as rapidly as possible Soviet people's needs for food and high-quality consumer goods, to building up the pace of housing and cultural and consumer construction, to improving health care and national education, and to creating a modern sphere of services and reliable transport communications.

A special place in social policy is occupied by the food question. It is primarily a case of providing the country's population with the most important foods and of creating the necessary working and daily living conditions for the people who produce these goods and of keeping them stably on the land.

In the period that has elapsed since the 27th CPSU Congress marked changes have taken place in the agrarian sector. The party's course toward restructuring and renewal has rocked the countryside. The economic reform which is being implemented and the developing process of democratization have made it possible not in words but in deeds to reveal hitherto somnolent powerful underlying forces. The transformations have gripped the rural collectives and this process is drawing them out of their state of social passiveness and apathy, arousing initiative and independence, and shaping an absolutely new social atmosphere.

Having analyzed the state of affairs in the country's agro-industrial complex, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed that until recently a number of republics and oblasts had still not overcome stagnation phenomena, are making poor use of the potential of the new mechanism of economic management, and are enlisting in an unsatisfactory manner existing reserves for the sector's intensification. Kurgan Oblast is among these oblasts. It was this which was the grounds for the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat's examination of the work of the oblast party organization on the countryside's social development. This work was deemed unsatisfactory.

What is the reason? Why, while possessing good natural and climatic conditions, rich arable farming traditions and experience, and a developed agro-industrial potential which has doubled in the past 15 years, has the oblast long been marking time in terms of agricultural production output, failing to improve the population's food supply, and failing to increase food deliveries to the state?

A study of this question showed that one of the main reasons for this stagnation is the underestimation of attention toward social questions and toward man and the disregard of man's daily requirements and needs.

Of course, in recent years this work has begun to be performed more purposefully. Programs have been adopted and are being implemented for the construction of housing, schools, children's institutions, and projects for culture and the development of health, trade, and the retooling and provision of amenities for stockraising units. Capital investments in the nonproduction sphere have increased. But the scales of these changes have proved utterly inadequate. To this day the Kurgan Oblast countryside continues to rank among the last in the RSFSR in terms of its provision with facilities.

Despite some advances in housing construction, the problem is being resolved extremely slowly. Over the 10th and 11th 5-Year Plans 7-8 apartments were constructed per farm, while in the past 2 years the figure has been 9-10 per farm while on 70 kolkhozes and sovkhozes only 1-2 apartments have been commissioned. In addition it must be kept in mind that only 13 percent of the housing stock in the oblast's villages is provided with sewage, only 24 percent has central heating, and only 19 percent has mains water supplies. About 40,000 inhabitants use water that has to be fetched. Water consumption per inhabitant is twice as low as for the RSFSR and Urals region as a whole.

You all know, the speaker stressed, how much work has to be invested to heat a house, to provide a family with water, not to mention maintaining the appurtenances of a household. It is not social production but this which accounts for the main labor load per person. This is the narrowest sector in the social sphere in the countryside. At the same time the plan for commissioning water pipeline networks on kolkhozes and sovkhozes is constantly being underfulfilled. In the past 12 years just 4 km of gas pipe and 5 km of sewage networks have been laid on the farms. At this rate the tasks will not be resolved even in a hundred years.

The organization of health care remains a most acute problem. There are three times fewer doctors and half as many mid-level medical personnel per 1,000 rural inhabitants as there are in the city. As of early 1988 in the 10 sector hospitals and 15 outpatient clinics not a single doctor's post was filled by specialists with higher education while at the 33 paramedical and midwifery centers not a single post was filled by specialists with secondary education. But even under these conditions priority is not given to the countryside in distributing specialists. In recent years only 45 percent of medical educational establishment graduates have been sent there, although cadres staffing levels are not in excess of 64 percent.

In 1987 the "Health" program provided for the allocation of 234 apartments to doctors, yet only 96 were allocated. What is this program worth if it is being fulfilled like this? And it is obviously no accident that the sickness rate among the rural population and children remains high. Every day about 5,000 kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers did not go to work because of sickness. Losses of work time to look after sick children were 78 days per 100 workers.

Trade services remain at an extremely low level. About 10 percent of villages have no stores. Stoppages in the trade in necessities are allowed. Consumer cooperative organizations are reducing trade turnover and failing to fulfill the plans for purchases of agricultural products. Every year they import goods from other oblasts to a sum of about R8 million. They even import wooden spades, clothes pegs, and mail boxes, although they could produce all this themselves.

The situation is no better with regard to organizing labor and daily living conditions in production. Half the stockraising units have no hot food or showers. There are no snack bars or medical preventive treatment centers. The two-shift work regime is being introduced only feebly. In recent years there has been no improvement of the level of comprehensive mechanization of labor on the stockraising units and in one-third of the rayons it has even declined.

V.P. Nikonov drew attention to the need to develop the road network. At present, he said, 256 farms, or 60 percent of farms in Kurgan Oblast have no reliable access roads. The network of internal farm roads is even less developed.

And how can we overlook the fact that in the past 7 years the plan for housing construction on kolkhozes and sovkhozes has never once been fulfilled through the efforts of contracting construction organizations? Construction workers for the agro-industrial complex fulfill only 58 percent of work and only 30 percent of housing erection. In a number of rayons "Kurganagropromstroy's" main contractor fulfills over half the program by installing establishments in rayon centers. Even in Shadrinsk, where large-scale construction organizations of the Ministry of Construction in the Urals and West Siberia Regions of the USSR operate, the rural construction workers fulfill one-third of their plan in the city. A similar practice exists in other cities and rayon centers in the oblast. The diversion of rural construction workers to secondary tasks is the position of the oblast leadership and it should be changed, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said.

Shortcomings in construction are frequently explained by the weakness of the construction industry and construction materials industry base. At the same time only 55 percent of the capacities of large-panel house construction have been put into operation and that includes only 36 percent of capacities in the agro-industrial complex, only 61 percent of brick production capacities, 43 percent of local industry enterprises' capacities, and 34 percent of capacities for the production of arbolit [concrete with wood chippings].

The speaker dwelled particularly on problems of individual and cooperative housing construction, which are a major reserve in resolving the housing problem in the city and in the countryside. Special resolutions have been adopted on the all-around development of this type of construction, large benefits have been established, and major material resources for retail trade have been allocated. But the oblast is still dealing with this question in an extremely unsatisfactory manner. In the past 20 years housing construction using this source of financing has been reduced by a factor of three and comprises only 9 percent of the total volume of housing commissioned. Nor is it proposed to expand it markedly in the future. In the 12th 5-Year Plan it is planned to construct only 13 percent of housing using funds from the rural population.

The unsatisfactory solution of social questions in the countryside does not help to overcome unfavorable demographic trends. The outflow of the rural population is continuing in the oblast and the cadres problem is being aggravated. Since 1970 the number of rural inhabitants has dropped by 108,000, or 16 percent. During this time hundreds of villages have disappeared. The rural population is aging markedly.

One of the main factors holding back the reorganization of the countryside is the weak agricultural production economy. The large shortfall of output in 1987 aggravated the financial and economic situation in the agrarian sector even more sharply. Three-quarters of all kolkhozes and sovkhozes ran at a loss. Total bank loan debts increased by R207 million last year, reaching R2.2 billion.

Economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] is so far failing to provide a proper return. It is merely formal on many kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The anti-expenditure mechanism has not been turned on fully and the "erosion" of farms' own funds continues. Yet the increase in rages considerably outstrips the increase in labor productivity.

Previously gained positions are also being surrendered for other very important indicators. For instance, in 1986-1987 the gross grain harvest declined to the level of the 10th 5-Year Plan, by 1 million tonnes. Yet at one time the oblast was an all-union school of arable farming and the Maltsev soil protection system was born here. The system is being used successful in many regions of the country, but the Kurgan Oblast farmers have not used it in earnest. Nor is there the proper return from the introduction of intensive technologies.

Priority importance should be given to increasing grain production in the oblast. This work must be transferred to the same basis as has been done for corn.

The provision of feed for stockraising remains one of the most acute problems. Complete helplessness is being displayed in resolving it. For decades only 60-70 percent of the required quantity of feed has been procured. As a rule its quality is low. Protein content is no more than 80-90 percent and due attention is not being paid to raising high-protein crops. The constant feed shortage and its low nutritional value are the main reason for the low animal productivity, which has not grown for many years. In 1987 some 2,158 kg of milk per cow were obtained, which is 100 kg less than was milked per cow in 1977. This is the lowest yield among the oblasts of the Urals region. The slow introduction of contract forms of organizing labor is among the main reasons for the low yield of agricultural crops and low animal productivity.

In organizing this work the party raykoms and agro-industrial organs have been unable to rid themselves entirely of formalism and oversimplification. Because of this on a number of farms the results of the work of contracting collectives have been worse than in a number of ordinary production subdivisions. The individual, family, and leasing contract is used very feebly.

The party obkom and the oblispolkom tolerate the slack development of the population's private auxiliary farms. The livestock population here continues to decline. Today every other rural household has no cows, there are few pigs, and every fourth plot has no animals at all. Many rural inhabitants refuse to keep livestock because there are no pastures or hay cuttings and there is not always an opportunity for buying a calf or piglet. This attitude toward the private household considerably aggravates the food problems.

In terms of the per capita consumption of foodstuffs the oblast lags considerably behind many of the country's oblasts. A considerable proportion of these foodstuffs do not reach inhabitants' tables because of the weakness of the sectors which process agricultural output and ensure its keeping. The reserve here is enormous. The addition to consumption resources through processing could be 20-30 percent as is convincingly borne out by the experience of Tomsk, Belgorod, and several other oblasts. In Kurgan Oblast work on developing the processing and storage base is being performed only feebly. As a result a large quantity of foods whose production could be organized locally continue to be imported here. They include mayonnaise, fruit candy and fruit-paste candy, canned vegetables, and even mineral water. Despite the fact that the CPSU Central Committee has frequently drawn local organs' attention to the need to take the most immediate steps to develop, retool, and reorient the base of the processing industry and to include the entire existing potential for resolving vital problems, there has been no radical breakthrough in these matters. Moreover, the practice of relegating processing enterprises to the ranks of the secondary continues to this day. In the first 2 years of the 5-year plan the plan for construction and installation work in the food sectors—a plan of insignificant volume—was fulfilled only 72 percent.

The solution of the food problem requires the fundamental restructuring of all the organizational activity of party, soviet, and economic organs, the improvement of work in the labor collectives, and the enhancement of their interest in the end results of labor. But for this a lot of work must be done selflessly and knowledgeably.

Ye.G. Vasilyuk, first secretary of the Petukhovskiy CPSU Raykom; V.D. Kokoteyev, secretary of the party committee of the "Krasnaya Zvezda" sovkhoz, Shadrinskiy Rayon; G.A. Bulatova, stockraising unit chief on the Lenin kolkhoz, Tselinnyy Rayon; A.P. Ustyuzhanin, first deputy chairman of the oblispolkom and chairman of the oblast agro-industrial committee; A.M. Koshmarinskiy, machine operator at the "Znamya Lenina" kolkhoz, Shumikhinskiy Rayon; A.A. Mosin, chairman of the Chastoozerskiy Rayispolkom; V.N. Kormin, director of the "Agropromdorstroy" trust, and others who spoke at the meeting submitted specific proposals to boost the countryside. They revealed shortcomings and spoke of the progress of restructuring which is being undertaken in the oblast, of the expansion of glasnost, and democratization in all spheres of life.

The resolution which was adopted outlined measures for the accelerated social development of Kurgan Oblast's villages.

PRAVDA on Tour

PM2106144588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Stay in Kurgan and Chelyabinsk Oblasts"]

[Text] V.P. Nikonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in Kurgan and Chelyabinsk Oblasts 9 through 15 June. He visited industrial enterprises, research institutes, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes and talked with urban and rural workers.

"Kurganselmash" is one of the largest machine-building enterprises for livestock raising. Milking machines, milk coolers, and other equipment for livestock units are produced here. At a meeting with workers and specialists there was talk of improving output quality and of the need to organize the manufacture of compact milking units for personal subsidiary plots and small lease livestock units.

A thorough discussion took place at the Kurgan dairy combine. Its collective has carried out reconstruction. However, the reconstruction is not producing the requisite return, the equipment is being used unproductively, and the range of output manufactured is poor.

In the agro-industrial complex V.P. Nikonov inquired about the introduction of progressive technologies, the lease and family contracts, and economic accountability [khozyaystvenny raschet] in crop growing and livestock raising. A thorough discussion took place with leaseholders at the Kravchenko Kolkhoz regarding the assimilation of complete economic accountability.

In recent years ties between the Kurgan Grain Farming Research Institute and kolkhozes and sovkhozes have considerably strengthened. Research institute scientists and specialists have elaborated grain techniques for cultivating corn. An economically accountable science and production system comprising 300 farms has been set up in the sector so that these techniques can be rapidly promoted in the fields of the oblast. The farms are using the grain techniques on 120,000 hectares of crops. Experimental plots with promising varieties and hybrids of grain and feed crops were examined and conversations were held with research institute staffers on ways of integrating agricultural science more closely with production.

During the inspection of the construction of the country's largest oxygen converter shop at the Magnitogorsk V.I. Lenin Metallurgical Combine in Chelyabinsk Oblast in conversations with working people it was stressed that the powerful development of metallurgy must be reinforced by an effective contribution to resolving the Food Program. Especially as the people of the southern Urals are increasingly experiencing a shortage of meat and dairy products, potatoes, and vegetables. It was noted that it is time for the people of Chelyabinsk and Magnitogorsk to switch to cardinal actions aimed at complete self-sufficiency.

Serious shortcomings in the organization of the lease contract were pointed out at the "Narovchatskiy," "Iskra," and "Petrovskiy" Sovkhozes and at the "Chelyabinskoye" Science and Production Association at a meeting with livestock raisers and crop farmers. This has led, in particular, to flagrant violations of corn cultivation techniques in the fields of certain farms. At the "Chebarkulskiy" Sovkhoz talk turned to the need to be thrifty with land, water, and equipment. It is important to awaken in people a responsible attitude toward matters.

At the South Urals Scientific Research Institute of Grain and Grain Products, the CPSU Central Committee secretary asked about the cultivation of protein-rich feed crops in experimental production sections. It was noted that the widespread introduction of such crops into practice will not only boost the productivity of livestock raising but will also make it possible to save a considerable amount of feed grain. Models of progressive soil cultivation equipment created by local scientists were examined.

In conversation with scientists and specialists attention was drawn to the establishment of close ties between scientific establishments and kolkhozes and sovkhozes, to which scientists owe a great deal.

At the Magnitogorsk CPSU Gorkom, at a meeting with the party and soviet aktiv of the city and the nearby rural rayons a proposal was voiced to create a powerful multisectorial agrocombine to pool the efforts of industrial enterprises, scientific potential, and the advanced experience of rural workers.

V.P. Nikonov was accompanied on his trip by the following: in Kurgan Oblast by A.N. Plekhanov, first secretary of the CPSU Obkom, and V.N. Gerasimov, chairman of the oblispolkom; and in Chelyabinsk Oblast by N.D. Shvyrev, first secretary of the CPSU Obkom, and B.M. Isayev, chairman of the oblispolkom.

Nikonov Attends Machinery Supplies Meeting

PM2106145788 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 8 Jun 88 p 1

[TASS report: "Supplying Agriculture With Reliable Equipment"]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jun—The solution of the tasks of comprehensively mechanizing agricultural production and supplying kolkhozes and sovkhozes with reliable, highly productive equipment occupies an important place in the range of measures being carried out to fulfill the 27th CPSU Congress decisions designed to substantially improve the country's food supply. It was these very problems that A.A. Yezhevskiy, USSR minister of agricultural and tractor machine building, and I. Chernoivanov, deputy chairman of the the USSR Gosagroprom, addressed in the reports they delivered to a joint session of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers Machine Building Bureau. Progress in the production of a system of machinery for the comprehensive mechanization of crop farming and stockraising and questions concerning priorities in developing agricultural machine building for 1988-1990 were examined.

It was noted that there has been no radical breakthrough in the supply of highly efficient equipment to agriculture. There were many complaints here against the USSR Ministry of Agricultural and Tractor Machine Building. For example, only 59 out of 113 machines required for the intensive cultivation of agricultural crops are being produced. The PSH-21.6 broad-span top dresser, implements for the OP-12 presowing soil cultivator, the SEK-3.3 localized fertilizer spreader, reversible plows, and much else have not yet started production. During an exchange of opinions perplexed speakers asked how it could happen that the question of the full supply of drags for the high-powered K-700 and T-150 tractors, the absence of which reduces their efficiency, has remained unsolved over a number of years.

Only 70 of the 111 items envisaged under the system of machinery and technical systems for postharvest processing and storage of grain and seed are in production. The grain driers with which threshing floors are equipped are of low productivity and are as a rule incapable of drying grain of increased moisture content without interrupting the production process. The solution of the problem of creating a reliable feed combine harvester has been dragged out over many years. A number of machines for the cultivation of feed beet and the production of flax and cotton are lacking.

The session noted that the USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, and the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry are failing to take resolute measures to organize the development and production of machinery and equipment for agriculture. As a result kolkhozes and sovkhozes are experiencing a shortage of fertilizer spreaders, vehicles, electric boilers, storage batteries, and other equipment. Speakers noted that slowness in developing and assimilating new machinery holds back the rate of technical progress and leads to unfavorable structural changes in the machine and tractor pool connected with the increased proportion of obsolete and technically imperfect equipment contained in it.

This situation is due in many respects to the fact that the ministries involved in producing agricultural equipment and acting as subcontractors are restructuring their work too slowly.

Serious criticism was made of the engineering and supply services of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, rayon agro-industrial associations, and agro-industrial committees and associations which accept delivery of substandard equipment and do not pay due attention to setting up and modernizing farms' repair and operational base or training engineers, technical cadres, and machine operators.

Agriculture needs a fundamental retooling of its material and technical base. It is important to speed up the creation of a reliable, highly efficient system of machinery for intensive production, feed production, and stockraising and to supply team and lease contract members with them, participants in the session stressed. The solution of the problems depends on both the industrial ministries and the USSR Gosagroprom.

V.P. Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the session.

The session was also addressed by V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom, and I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Machine Building Bureau.

Scientific

'Cosmos-1954' Satellite Launched 21 Jun

LD2206060188 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0552 GMT 22 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jun (TASS)—Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1954, was launched in the USSR on Tuesday by a Cosmos booster rocket. The satellite is intended to continue the exploration of space. It has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution—100.8 minutes; maximum distance from earth's surface—819 km; minimum—783; inclination of orbit—74 degrees. The apparatus is functioning normally.

Kharitonov Reports on Soviet Space Activities

LD2106133888 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—A total of 116 space apparatuses of various types were put into orbit in the USSR for scientific or economic purposes. This has been reported by Gennadiy Kharitonov, deputy head of the Intercosmos Council at the USSR Academy of Sciences. At the request of a TASS correspondent he commented on the results of the USSR space exploration in 1987 in connection with the 31st session of the U.N. Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The session opened in New York last week.

Gennadiy Kharitonov pointed out that the space apparatuses put into orbit included 97 artificial earth satellites of the Cosmos series intended for tackling scientific and economic problems, three manned Soyuz TM spaceships, the Kvant astrophysical module, seven automatic cargo spaceships of the Progress class, the artificial earth satellites Raduga, Ekran and Meteor-2, two of each type, as well as Molniya-3 and Gorizont-1 satellites. They were put into orbit by 95 delivery vehicles. On five occasions one carrier rocket put into orbit several Cosmos satellites at a time.

Flight and design tests of Energiya, a general-purpose carrier rocket, were started last year. The rocket which has a start mass of 2,000 tons is capable of putting into orbit more than 100 tons of cargo. Energiya permits to exploit the near-earth and outer space in a planned way and to conduct large-scale research.

A record-long space flight of the Soviet Cosmonaut Yuriy Romanenko on board the Mir space station was a major achievement of Soviet cosmonautics in 1987. It lasted 326 days. The flight confirmed the effectiveness of a method of gradual increase of the length of space expeditions developed by Soviet specialists.

The Kvant module docked with the Mir stations in April 1987 permitted to conduct important astrophysical research. Specifically, a flash of a supernova in the large Magellanic cloud was detected with the help of the Roentgen orbital observatory which is part of its equipment. The ultraviolet telescope Glazar permitted to make 270 photos of various sections of the sky.

Scientists Say No Ozone Hole Over Antarctic

LD1906135788 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 18 Jun 88

[Summary] There are eight Soviet scientific stations in the Antarctic. "I'll tell you the latest news, though. Our scientists say there is no ozone hole over the Antarctic. The hole has filled up. It seems the hole is one of the unsolved peculiarities of atmospheric circulation in the Antarctic".

Leaders Sign Obituary of Geologist Smirnov

PM2106092888 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 88 Second Edition p 8

[Obituary: "Academician Vladimir Ivanovich Smirnov"]

[Excerpts] Soviet science has suffered a heavy loss. Hero of Socialist Labor Academician Vladimir Ivanovich Smirnov, a major Soviet scientist in the sphere of ore deposits, geology, and metallogeny and faculty chief at M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, died on 16 June 1988 at the age of 78.

V.I. Smirnov was born in Moscow 31 January 1910. [passage omitted]

V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, A.N. Yakovlev, V.I. Dolgikh, G.I. Marchuk, V.A. Grigoryev, Ye.A. Kozlovskiy, G.A. Yagodin, Ye.P. Velikhov, B.A. Koptyug, V.A. Kotelnikov, A.A. Logunov, P.N. Fedoseyev, A.L. Yanshin, V.V. Ryabov, I.M. Makarov, B.S. Sokolov, M.I. Agoshkov, V.L. Barsukov, V.A. Zharikov, N.P. Laverov, B.V. Menner, V.A. Magnitskiy, M.A. Sadovskiy, Ye.M. Sergeyev, A.A. Trofimuk, E.D. Yershov, V.A. Sadovnichiy, L.V. Tauson, V.Ye. Khain, N.A. Shilo, G.A. Tvalchrelidze, A.M. Dymkin, A.A. Marakushev, Ye.Ye. Milanovskiy, A.D. Shcheglov, D.V. Rundkvist.

Military

Tank, Train Collide; Officers Disciplined

PM2106080988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jun 88 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Following Up KRASNAYA ZVEZDA article": "'Why It Happened'"]

[Text] The dispatch by Colonel G. Miranovich published on 9 February under the above headline discussed the reasons for an accident on a section of the Leipzig-Berlin main line, which occurred as a result of a collision between an express train and a tank belonging to a Group of Soviet Forces in Germany unit.

Army General B. Snetkov, commander in chief of the group's forces, and Colonel General N. Moiseyev, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate, have reported to the editorial office that the lessons of the accident were analyzed at a session of the Military Council of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany and at a party aktiv meeting. Urgent measures have been taken to increase the responsibility of the command and political cadres for organizing combat training, observing safety measures, and ensuring the accident-free operation of equipment and arms.

The state of ranges, training fields, and traffic routes has been checked. Work has been carried out to enclose dangerous sections and routes with a view to preventing combat vehicles from straying onto railroad tracks, onto highways, and into population centers. Further warning signs, barriers, and other obstacles have been set up.

Measures have been taken to improve the system for manning the training units, and students who were unable to master the training program have been dismissed. Measures have been discussed with the chiefs of training unit political organs to improve the education of personnel and step up discipline.

Strict proceedings have been taken against Lieutenant General V. Sadovnikov, the Group of Forces deputy commander for combat training, and Colonel F. Bondarenko, department chief in the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany Combat Training Directorate. Lieutenant Colonel V. Korzhakov, commander of the N [not further identified] training regiment, Lieutenant Colonel A. Tretyakov, chief of the unit political department, and Major V. Shamshur, commander of the training company, have been dismissed from their posts and expelled from the CPSU. Senior Lieutenant A. Shchavelev, commander of the training platoon, has also been expelled from the CPSU. Measures of administrative and party influence have been taken against other people to blame for the accident. Material on Major V. Shamshur has been passed to the investigative organs.

The answer to the newspaper article signed by Colonel N. Nastashchuk, military commissar of Aktyubinsk Oblast, and Lieutenant Colonel A. Yunakovskiy, chief of the Oblast Military Commissariat Political Department, says that the lessons of what happened as a result of Private Zh. Okhapov's actions have been discussed at a general meeting of Communists in Aktyubinsk Oblast rayon military commissariats. Captain S. Orazmukhammedov, military commissar of Uilskiy Rayon, has been severely reprimanded and has had his record endorsed for serious omissions in his work.

Measures to improve young people's preparation for military service have been discussed at the party obkom secretariat.